

A
DISCOURSE
OF THE
Love of God.

SHEWING,
That it is well consistent with some
Love or Desire of the Creature.

And Answering

All the Arguments of Mr. Norris in
his Sermon on *Matth. 22. 37.* And of the
Letters Philosophical and Divine to the
Contrary.

By DANIEL WHITBY, *Chantor of
the Church of Sarum.*

*I suppose that All which is intended by that Phrase, Thou shalt Love
the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, &c. amounts to no more than
(1st,) a sincere Love, as 'tis opposed to that which is partial, and di-
vided; and (2dly,) such a degree of Loving as admits of nothing into
Competition with him. Mr. Norris's Treatise of Heroick Piety. p.182.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for Awnsham and John Churchill, at the Black
Swan in Pater-Noster-Row. 1697.

ISLAND

TO THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

TO THE READER.

I Think I have sufficiently considered all that is material both in the *Sermon*, and in the *Letters* of Mr. N. and the *Lady*. In his *Preface* he endeavours to vindicate his Exposition from Singularity, appealing, 1. to the *Books* that are written after the *Mystical and Spiritual way*, i. e. those *Phanatical Pretenders* to extraordinary Visions and Illuminations, to *passive Unions*, and *Deiform Funds* of the Soul, a State of *Introversion*, and a *Supereffential Life*, who talk of being *ba-* Dr. Still. Fa-
nat. of the
Ch. of Rome,
P. 327.
losed in the Midhead of God, and in his *Meek-* P. 259.
head, and his *Benignity*, and in his *Buxom-*
ness. And sure it is not much for his
Glory that such Persons speak like him.

2. To some *French Poets* and *Divines*, which neither can we envy him.

But, 3. Whereas he calls in the Suffrage of the *Reverend* and *Learned Bishop Lake*, a Man too Great to be overlook'd; he is the very Person whose sense of the words contested I have given, *Chap. 3. §. 1.* and

To the READER.

On Matth.
22. 27.

who in his *Seventh Sermon* is most express against him in these words, But *mistake me not, All other things besides God, are not excluded of our Love.* — “Wherefore, for
“ the farther understanding of this *Entire-*
“ *ness of the Love of God*, we must not
“ take other things *opposite*, but *compositè*;
“ we must exclude nothing from our Love
“ that doth not enter into competition
“ with God, and oppose it self against
“ the Love of God.

2dly, ‘If there be any thing that may be
“ loved jointly with God, it must not be
“ taken as *Coordinatum*, but *Subordinatum*;
“ it must not share equally with God,
“ but keep its distance, and receive our
“ Love by a reflection from God.

3dly, “ Upon this Inequality must our
“ Love ground an unequal Estimate of
“ things, and we must love God *above all*
“ *Appretiative*; we must account all, in
“ comparison of God, to be as Dung, to
“ be very Loss.

4thly, “ Finally, according to the Esti-
“ mate, must the heat of our Affection
“ be; we must love God *above all Inten-*
“ *tive* also; we must love other things as
“ fit to be used, not fit to be enjoy’d, yea,
“ we must use all the World *as if we used*
“ *it not*, but we must love God as him
“ whom we would not only use, but en-
“ joy also

Again,

To the READER.

Again, "There be many things and P. 335:

"Persons which we are allow'd to love,
"but we must love them only until they
"come to the Comparifon. If then the
"Question be, Whether of the two we
"love more, to Whether of them we will
"stick in a cafe where both cannot be
"held; or upon which of them we will
"fall foul, when it is not poffible for us
"to keep in with both, if then we can
"with *Moses*, *esteem the Reproach of Chrift*
"*greater Riches than the Treafures of Egypt*,
"we conform our felves to Chrift's firft
"Rule.

"Thus if we love God, we love him P. 336.
"as we ought, that is, we love him *above*
"*all things*, and we love him *for himfelf*;
"for that muft needs follow when we
"love him for no other thing, no not
"for our own fakes, but are willing to
"hazard all, even our felves and all, for
"the love of him. This, I hope, is
"fufficient to fhew that *Excellent Prelate* is
"an Adverfary to the Expoftion of Mr. N.
"and an Abettor of the Vulgar Expoftion.

"He appeals, 4thly, to *St. Auguftin*, in his
Devotional Tracts. Now true it is, that
St. Auguftin hath faid many things which,
to one unacquainted with his ufe of Phra-
fes, may miflead him into this Imagina-
tion, tho', as he doth explain them, it

To the READER.

is evident they are nothing to the purpose. *V. G.* He inveighs very much *contra cupiditatem mundi*, but then he lets you

Cupiditatem voco omnem motum ad fruendum se, & proximo, & quolibet corpore non propter Deum. De Doctr. Christian. l. 3. c. 10.

know that we are then only Guilty of it, *when our Souls move towards themselves, their Neighbour, or any other thing without respect to God.*

For otherwise he informs us that the Fault we commit in the use of these tran-

Nam in omnibus hujusmodi rebus non ex earum rerum natu-

sitory things, is not in the nature of the things themselves, but from the cause of using, and the manner or degree of desiring them.

ra quibus utimur, sed ex causa utendi, & modo appetendi, vel probandum est, vel improbandum, quod facimus, cap. 12.

Sometimes he will not allow us *diligere terrena*, but then it is because *dilection*

Dilectionis enim nomen magis solet in melioribus rebus dici, in melioribus rebus accipi. To. 9. Tr. 8. in Ep. Johan. p. 633.

is a word that is used properly only for the love of better things.

Sometimes he will also tell us we must not *amare*, love Earthly things; but then to love them is, in his Language, *only to affect them for themselves*; for otherwise,

Nil aliud est amare, quam propter se ipsum rem aliquam appetere. To. 4. 80 Qu. c. 35. p. 543.

saith he, *Non prohibet te Deus amare ista, sed non deigere ad beatitudinem*, God doth not absolutely forbid thee to love these things, but he forbids thee to love them as thy Happiness.

He

To the READER.

He also oft informs us that we must not enjoy, but only use these things, but then he adds, That we enjoy that only which we love for it self, and in which we place our Happiness, and make the end of our Joy; but if by enjoying be only meant that using them with delight, and so as to pass from them to that in which we ought to rest; this he allows of.

Decimus ea re nos perfrui, quam diligimus propter scipsam, & ea re nobis fruendum esse sanctum, quae efficiuntur beati,

ti, ceteris vero utendum. De Doctr. Christian. l. i. c. 31.

Quaquam & vicinissime dicitur frui, cum delectatione uti, cum enim adest quod diligitur, etiam delectatione jecum, necesse est, gerat, per quam si transferis, eamque ad illud ubi permanendum est, retuleris, uteris ea, & abusus. non propterea diceris frui, si vera inhaeris, atque permaneris finem in ea ponens laetitiae tuae, tunc verè, & frui dicendus es. Cap. 33.

Take St *Austin* without his own Interpretation of the words *Love, Dilection, Concupiscence, Enjoyment*, and he seems oft to favour Mr. N.'s new Notion; but if he be permitted to be his own Interpreter, he will be found to have said nothing to his purpose, of which we cannot have a fuller Evidence than his own Exposition on the words urged by Mr. N. for his own Opinion. For,

I. St. *Austin* in his First Book of *Christian Doctrine*, sets himself expressly to the Consideration of the words of St. *Matthew*, Chap. 22. 37. and in his Discourse upon them expressly grants, That the love of our selves, and the love of the Body, and

To the READER.

Modus ergo of Provisions for it is included; and for this, diligendi præcipiendus est homini, id est Nature teaching us, and the Beasts thus to quomodo se love.

diligat, aut proficit sibi, quin autem se diligat aut proficit sibi dubitare, dementis est; præcipiendum etiam quomodo Corpus suum diligat, nam quod diligat corpus suum, idque saluum habere, atque integrum velit, æque manifestum est. — Ergo præcepto non opus est ut se quisque, & corpus suum diligat, quum id quod sumus, & id quod infra nos est, & ad nos tantum pertinet, inconcussa naturæ lege diligimus. Cap. 25.

And when he comes to give us the sum of what he had discoursed upon this Subject, he begins it with this Advertisement, That there needs no Precept to engage us to love our selves; and that we may know, and do this, the whole temporal Dispensation of Providence, saith he, was designed, which we are to use not with a permanent Love and Delight, but only with a transitory, as being the way, the Vehecles, the Instruments, the things by which we are carried up to him we love.

Hoc ergo ut nosceremus, & possemus, facta est tota pro salute nostra per divinam providentiam

dispensatio temporalis, quâ debemus uti, non quasi manjoria quadam dilectione, atque delectatione, sed transitoria potius, tanquam via, tanquam vehiculorum, — Ut ea quibus ferimur, propter illud ad quod ferimur, diligamus. Cap. 35.

In his set Discourse upon those words of St John, Love not the World, neither the things of the World, he expressly declares, That God doth not absolutely forbid us to love these things, but only not to love them

To the READER.

them as our Happiness ; not so as to neglect our Creator ; that he requires us to use a mean in our Affection to them, and not to enjoy what we should only use, nor have our Affections cleaving to them.

Non te prohibet Deus amare ista, sed non diligere ad beatitudinem, sed ad hoc probare, & laudare,

ut ames creatorem — Si autem amaveris has, quamvis illa Deus fecerit, & neglexeris creatorem — Nonne tuus amor Adulterinus deputabitur ? — Nunquid non est in his modus ? Aut quando dicitur, Nolite ista diligere, hoc dicitur ? Ut non manducetis, aut non bibatis aut filios non procreetis ? Non hoc dicitur, sed sit modus propter creatorem, ut non vos illigent istu dilectione, ne ad fruendam hoc ametis, quod ad utendum habere debetis. Tr. 2. p. 592.

In his Meditations, which is one of his Devotional Tracts, he observes how the World, and all things in it serve both our Necessity and Delight ; but hence he will allow us to love them only as things Subject to, and serving of us, as the Gifts of God, remembering that we owe them to him, and must not love them for themselves, but for him, not with him, but for him, and should love him by, and above them. And this I think may be sufficient to acquaint us with the Opinion of St. Austin in this Matter.

Respicere universum mundum & consideranda si in eo aliquid sit quod tibi non serviat omnis creatura ad hunc finem cursum suum dirigit ut obsequiis tuis famuletur, & utilitati deserviat tuis-

que oblectamenti pariter & necessitatibus secundum affluentiam & deficientiam occurrat. — Si autem ista Diligis ut subjecta dilige, ut arum sponsi, ut munera amici, & beneficia Domini ; sic tamen ut memineris semper quod illi debeas, nec ista propter se sed ista propter illum, nec ista cum illo sed ista propter illum & per ista illum & super ista illum diligas. Cap. 4.

I am only farther to acquaint the Reader, that the Substance of many of these
Argu-

To the READER.

Arguments was sent to Mr. N. long before his *Letters* appeared in Print, and seeing he thought none of them worthy of the least notice, I humbly offer them to the Reader, (especially to the Ingenuous Author of the late Discourse concerning the Love of God, to whom I own my self obliged) and rest.

T H E

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

The Question, Whether we are obliged to love God, so entirely, as that we may love nothing else with a love of Desire, §. 1. This Assertion is shew'd to be contrary, 1st. To our Prayers for our daily Bread, §. 2. 2^{dly}, To God's Promises of temporal good Things, §. 3. And to his Threats of temporal Evils, §. 4. 3^{dly}, To the Representation of them as God's Gifts and Blessings, and our good Things, §. 5. To God's Command to rejoice in them, §. 6. To the Industry required by God to procure these things, and his Blessing promised to that Industry, §. 7. Proofs from Reason, That God hath not absolutely forbidden the Desire of Pleasure, of Honour, or of temporal Enjoyments, §. 8. Corollaries : 1. That this Doctrine is inconsistent with our Obligation to Pray, and with the Prayers of our own, and of Ancient Liturgies. 2. With the Praises due to God for temporal Blessings, and with the Thanksgivings for them used in our Liturgy. 3. It tends to depreciate the Divine Gifts, to teach Men to slight God's Promises, and contemn his Threats. 4. To destroy all Industry in our Calling. 5. It lays the vilest Imputation upon the Dispensations of God's Providence towards us, §. 9.

Page 1
CHAP.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. II.

To avoid the seeming Inconsistence betwixt the Love of God only, and the Love of my Neighbour as my self, it is said, That the Love of God with all our Heart enjoined in the First Commandment, is the Love of Desire; the Love of my Neighbour required in the Second, is only Love of Benevolence, §. 1. To take off this Evasion it is proved, First, That the Love of God required in the Injunction to love him with all our Hearts, &c. cannot be discharged by a Love of Desire only, but requires also a Love of Benevolence, §. 2. Secondly, That though the Love of our Neighbour here enjoined be not love of Desire of him as our Good, yet neither is it love of Benevolence, or wishing well to him only, but to the due performance of it, a desire of the Creature is necessary, §. 3. Thirdly, That the Love of our selves, our Relatives, our Neighbour, and our Friend (all which, saith Mr. N. is love of Benevolence only) is indeed that Love which chiefly opposes, and obstructs our Love to God, and is the rise of our inordinate Affections to the World, §. 4. Fourthly, That tho^t the Command to Love our Neighbour as our selves, doth not require us to Love our Neighbour as our Good, yet is not only lawful, but very commendable so to do, §. 5. This Doctrine, That the Love of God is entirely exclusive of all Love to, and Desire of the Creature, destroys the Foundation of these two great Virtues, Justice and Charity, §. 6. It also casts a great Contempt upon the Works both of Creation and of Providence, §. 7.

P. 27

CHAP.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. III.

The ordinary Exposition of these Words, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, &c. laid down in the Words of Mr. N. and of the Schoolmen, viz. That we are obliged by them to love God above all Things; 1. Apprehensively; 2. Comparatively; 3. Intensively; and, 4. So as to love other things only by way of Relation, and Subordination to God. §. 1. That our Lord Christ hath approved of this Exposition is shewed, §. 2. The Censure which Mr. N. gives of this Opinion, and the Abettors of it, reflects very unbecomingly upon all the Prelates and Pastors of the Church of England, which are not of his Mind, and lays unworthy Imputations on them, §. 3. Some General Considerations offered to engage him to abate somewhat of his Confidence, and his Censorious Reflections for the future, §. 4. Especially this, That they who adhere to the common Exposition of these Words, differ no more from him, than he differs from his former self, Sect. 5. The common Exposition further confirmed; First, From this Consideration, That this Command was given to the Jewish Nation, whose Promises were chiefly Temporal, and therefore could not be exclusive of the desire of Temporal Blessings, Sect. 6. That therefore it ought to bear that Sense, which is the certain Import of the like Phrases in all the Old Testament, where they are only to be found, which Sense is plainly opposite to that which Mr. N. contends for, Sect. 7. The true Sense of loving God with all the Heart and Soul in the Old Testament, shew'd from that primary Relation,

The CONTENTS.

lation, and respect it bath to their owning God to be the true God, in opposition to all strange Gods, §. 8. Secondly, From this Consideration, That this Love is required as the Condition of Salvation, §. 9. Thirdly, That to love God with all our Mind cannot bear this Sense, §. 10. The common Exposition serves all the Designs of Religion in General, and of Christian Religion in Particular, as well as the Exposition of Mr. N. and the Lady, §. 11. P. 53

CHAP. IV.

*This Chapter contains an Answer to Mr. N.'s Arguments from Scripture, for a Love of God exclusive of all love of Desire of the Creature ; as, V. G. 1st. From these Words, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c. Matth. 22. 37. §. 1. 2dly. From those Words of St. James, Ye Adulterers and Adulteresses, know ye not that the Friendship of this World is Enmity to God, James 4. 4 §. 2. 3dly, From these Words of St. John, Love not the World, neither the things that are in the World, 1 John 2. 15. §. 3. And to his Arguments against the Relative Love of the Creature, V. G. 1. That it is as much Idolatry, as the Relative Worship of the Creature. This Answered, 1. ad hominem, by shewing that it was formerly approved by Mr. N. 2. By shewing the Disparities betwixt the Relative Love of the Creature, and the Relative Worship of Images, §. 4. Object. 2. If Creatures be truly and properly lovely, as being our true and proper Good, they are to be loved absolutely and for themselves ; if not, they are not to be loved
at*

The CONTENTS.

at all. Answered, By shewing in what Sense they may be stiled our true and proper Good, and be loved for themselves, viz. as that imports a love of them only for that Goodness God hath put into them; and how they may not be loved absolutely, and for themselves, viz. as that excludes the Subordination of that Affection to the Love of God, §. 5. P. 91.

CHAP. V.

Mr. N. grants, That we may seek and use sensible things for our Good, but, saith he, we must not love them as our Good; and that we may approach to them by a bodily Movement, but not with the Movements of the Soul. This is Examined and Confuted, §. 1. Argument 1. That God is the sole Cause of our Love, and therefore hath the sole Right to it. Answered, §. 2. Argument 2. The Motion of the Will is Good in General, i. e. to all Good, and therefore to God only. Answered, §. 3. Argument 3. God is the end of our Love, since he cannot act for a Creature, but only for himself; or move us to a Creature, but only to himself. Answer'd, §. 4. Argument 4. That God cannot be loved too much, nor the World too little. Answered, §. 5. Argument 5. That God having called us thus to the Love of himself, cannot afterwards send us to a Creature, §. 6. Argument 6. A Man cannot repent of placing his whole Affection upon God, or have any thing to Answer for on that account. Answered, §. 7. Argument 7. God only is to be loved, because he only acts upon our Spirits, produceth our Pleasure, and he only does us Good. Answered,

ed, §. 8. *What the Lady offers on this Subject*
briefly Considered, and Answered, § 9. P.114

ERRATA.

P Age 2. Line 7. in the Margin, *ἰμναῖον*. p. 3. l. 25.
greater worth: p. 7. l. 5. affect: p. 8. l. 20. our: p. 9. l. 2.
fat: p. 16. l. 16. *ἀγαθόν*: p. 17. l. 3. add our: p. 24. l. 27.
add are: p. 35. l. 17. add desires: p. 44. l. 25. add as: p. 45.
l. 6. the: p. 46. l. 25. add all: p. 49. l. 15. *ἐλάττω*: p. 51. l. 18.
add giveth: p. 52. l. 6. add fatness: p. 58. l. 17. dependent:
p. 66. l. 19. dele him: p. 67. l. 5. entreat: p. 69. l. 25. accuse:
p. 73. l. 25. add from: p. 74. l. 15. add be: p. 75. l. 28. affect:
p. 104. l. 11. them: p. 106. l. 14. the: p. 111. l. 32. the: p.
121. l. 14. be: p. 139. l. 3. Justice: p. 143. l. 10. of: p. 153.
l. 21. us:

A
DISCOURSE
OF THE
Love of God.

CHAP. I.

The Contents.

The Question, Whether we are obliged to love God so entirely, as that we may love nothing else with a love of desire, § 1. This Assertion is shew'd to be contrary, 1st, To our Prayers for our daily bread, § 2. 2dly, To God's Promises of temporal good Things, § 3. And to his Threats of temporal Evils, § 4. 3dly, To the Representation of them as God's Gifts and Blessings, and our good Things, § 5. To God's Command to rejoice in them, § 6. To the Industry required by God to procure these things, and his Blessing promised to that Industry, § 7. Proofs from Reason, that God hath not absolutely forbidden the Desire of Pleasure, of Honour, or of temporal Enjoyments, § 8. Corollaries :

B

1, *That*

A Discourse of

1. That this Doctrine is inconsistent with our Obligation to Pray, and with the Prayers of our own, and of Ancient Liturgies.
2. With the Praises due to God for temporal Blessings, and with the Thanksgivings for them used in our Liturgy.
3. It tends to depreciate the Divine Gifts, to teach Men to slight God's Promises, and condemn his Threats.
4. To destroy all Industry in our Calling.
5. It lays the vilest Imputation upon the Dispensations of God's Providence towards us, § 9.

THE love of a Being infinitely Excellent in himself, and infinitely Beneficial to us, is so much our Duty and so much our Interest, 'tis such an excellent preservative against the Charms of sinful Pleasures, and all the Lures of those Temptations which tend to the destruction of our precious

Τελειότης ὁ
 πῶς οἰκτίας
 ἐν ζωῇ α-
 νάλη-ψις
 πρὸς τὸ θε-
 ον ὁμολωσιν
 ἡ παρανομία
 Hier. in
 Carm. Pyth.
 P. 3.

Souls ; such a powerful incentive to that Obedience and Holiness, which will most certainly conclude in everlasting Happiness; such a constraining motive to that assimilation to God, which renders us partakers of the Divine Nature, and by the *Heathen Moralists* is truly stiled *The Perfection of Man* : 'Tis such a Treasury of inward Satisfactions, and ravishing Delights ; such a *Feast of Marrow and Fatness* ; such a sovereign Antidote against the Miseries and Evils of this present Life ; such a Spring of sweet Contentment under all Conditions, and of entire resignation to the Will of our Beloved, that a good Man cannot, without Reluctancy of Mind, and secret Regret, seem to dislike any Opinions or Hypotheses which are honestly designed to advance it

it to the highest pitch. And did I not certainly believe, that the Measures of Divine Love I approve of, and contend for, serve all those glorious Ends, and minister as properly and fully to kindle and advance within us this divine Affection, as do those high and impracticable Stretches to which my worthy Friend, and this Incomparable Lady, with so great Beauty of Expressions, and with as hearty Zeal, have laboured to scrue it up; and that they do all this without those Inconveniencies to which their singular Hypothesis seems evidently exposed; and without those Temptations it may minister to Men not well affected unto Piety, and without those Misbodings it may create in those who are religiously enclined, I should not have given my self the uneasy task of contradicting the Opinions of Persons I so highly and so justly love and honour; or the Fatigue of canvassing the ensuing Question so fully as these Papers do, I hope, without offence to either of the Persons concerned; because with all the Defe-
 rence I can shew to their great Endowments, and their great Works, The Question then is this,

Quest. Whether the Scripture doth require us to love God so entirely, as that we may love nothing else with a love of desire, though it be only with Subordination to him? So the philosophical and divine Letters dogmatically do assert; declaring, That the love of God is exclusive of all other Prof. love; that it requires us in Justice to withdraw P. 132. every straggling desire from the Creature; and that it is clear from the letter of the Command- P. 4.

A Discourse of

ment, that God is not only the Principal, but the sole Object of our Love. Whence it must follow, that every degree of desire of any Creature is a sin, as being a transgression of this Precept. 2dly, Hence it must follow, that this sin is plain Idolatry; for Idolatry consists in giving that Reverence and Affection to the Creature, which is due only to the Creator. If therefore no degree of love, or of desire, be due unto the Creature, but to the Creator only, by loving or desiring the Creature in any degree whatsoever, we must give the affection to the Creature which is only due to the Creator, and therefore must be guilty of Idolatry. Hence suitably to their Opinion

Serm. p. 61. 'tis asserted, That the Creatures are no more our Goods, than our Gods; and we may as well worship them, as love them. And again, p. 77, 78. As to worship the Creature, though but relatively, is to give that worship to the Creature which is proper to God; so to love the Creature, though but relatively, is to give that love to the Creature which is proper to God. I cannot see why one should not be reckoned Idolatry, as well as the other. Now Idolatry in the New Testament is frequently declared to be a damning sin, which they that do shall not inherit the Kingdom of God: No Idolater having any inheritance in the Kingdom of God, or of Christ, but in the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death. So that, according to this new Divinity, if I desire Fire as my good, when I am starved with cold, I shall be cast into Hell fire: And if I love a Woman, and so desire her for a Wife, I must be excluded from Heaven because I love, and I desire a Creature. More-

1 Cor. 6. 9,

10.

Gal. 5. 19.

Eph. 5. 5.

Col. 3. 5.

Moreover these Letters lay this down for *P. 203.*
certain, That he that desires any thing besides God,
whatever he pretends, or however he deceives him-
self, does not truly love God. And, that when-
ever the Soul moves toward the Creature, it must
necessarily forsake the Creator ; and that it can
never truly turn to him without a dereliction of
all besides him. Now, if it cannot truly love him,
it never can be loved by him, if it can never
truly turn to him, it can never be converted,
and so it never can be saved ; if it forsake the
Creator, by desiring, or moving towards any
Creature, it must perish ; for, saith the Pro-
phet, all that forsake thee shall be ashamed, and *Isa. I. 28.*
consumed. Now is it not strange Doctrine to *Jer. 17. 13.*
affirm as certain, That we cannot truly love
God, if we desire our daily bread ; that I for-
sake God, if I move towards meat when I
am hungry, or drink when I am thirsty ?
Such Doctrines as these tend plainly to per-
swade Men, that God requires what they find
opposite to their very Constitution, and Be-
ing in this World, and so impossible for them
to perform and live ; and this must render the
highest act of our Religion, the divine Love,
ridiculous to some, and drive the weaker sort
of People into despair, by giving them occa-
sion to think they do not love God truly, or
as they ought, because they, by experience,
find they love a Dish of good Meat, and a
Cup of good Drink, and cannot but desire
the one when they are hungry, and the other
when thirsty.

In opposition to this new Opinion, I shall
endeavour to shew,

A Discourse of

First, That it is manifestly and expressly contrary to the plain Dictates of the Holy Scripture, and the Experience and Reason of Mankind.

Secondly, That it is contrary to the Commandment which enjoins us to *love our Neighbour as our selves*.

Thirdly, That it virtually destroys the Foundation of those two great moral Virtues, Justice and Charity.

Fourthly, That it casts a vile contempt upon the Works of God, to wit, his Works of Creation, and of Providence.

Fifthly, That it is attended with many other pernicious Consequences.

Sixthly, That it hath been expressly and manifoldly contradicted, even by him who now so hotly contends for it.

Seventhly, And lastly, I shall endeavour to return a plain and satisfactory Answer to all that's offer'd for this Doctrine, from Scripture or Reason.

§. 2.

First, It is manifestly and expressly contrary to the plain Dictates of the Holy Scripture, and the Experience and Reason of Mankind. To make this evident, I lay this down as the Foundation, That love of Concupiscence, and of Desire, are the same; Desire being in English the same which *ἐκδυσία* and *Concupiscentia* are in Greek and Latin. Love is, saith Mr. N. *a motion of the Soul towards Good, and thus considered it is what we call Concupiscence, or Desire.* Now hence it necessarily follows, that what I desire, I do also love; and that I may innocently love, what I may lawfully desire to have

Theory of
Love, p. 12,
74.

this Imagination ; 1. That our Bread is our Good. 2. That we may lawfully desire, and therefore love all that in this Petition is comprehended under the name of daily Bread.

Again, St. Paul condemns those *Hereticks* 1 Tim. 4. 3, who taught Men to *abstain from meats which* 4, 5. *God hath created to be received with thanks-giving of them who believe, and know the truth; (viz. that nothing is unclean of it self, Rom. 14. 14.) For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving. For it is sanctified by the word, and prayer.* By the Word, giving us Authority to eat of every Herb, and every living Creature : And by Prayer, asking these good Creatures of him who is the giver of every good Thing. Here then again we learn, First, That every Creature of God is good ; i. e. is good for Food to be received by us, and therefore for our Food, and consequently for good ; and why else is it to be received with thanksgiving ; for what we are obliged to thank him for is sure his Blessing, and our good. Secondly, Hence we learn also, That every Creature which is thus good for us, must be desired of God, it being Sanctified or fitted for our use, *ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία*, by Intercession to God for the Enjoyment of it.

§. 3. Secondly, God moves us to the performance of our Duty by the promise of these temporal good Things, to walk in the ways of wisdom, because *length of days are in her right hand, and in her left hand riches and honour :* Prov. 3. 14, 15, 16. To Uprightness of Life, because *wealth and riches shall be in the house of the upright :* Psalm 112. 3, 3. Works

the Love of God.

9

Works of Charity, because *the liberal soul shall be made full, and he that watereth shall be watered again, and he that soweth plentifully shall reap plentifully*; and because *He that hath pity on the poor lendeth to the Lord, and that which he giveth will he pay him again*: To Meekness, and Trust in God, because *such shall inherit the earth, and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace*: To seek first the kingdom of God, and the righteousness thereof, that all these things may be added to us: To live piously, because *Godliness hath the promise of this life, as well as that which is to come*. Now, can any rational Man deny, That what God promiseth as the Reward of our Obedience, is our Good; or doth he not allow, and even encourage us to affect and to desire what he doth promise! We therefore by these Promises are taught of God to love, and to desire the good things of this present Life.

Pro. 11. 25.

2 Cor. 9. 6.

Pro. 19. 17.

Pf. 37. 9. 11.

Mat. 6. 33.

1 Tim. 1. 8.

Moreover, our blessed Saviour promiseth to them who forsake *Houses and Lands and Life, for his sake and the Gospel's, an hundred fold here, and afterwards eternal life*. Now, if none of these things are fit to be the Objects of our Love, if they be not desirable to us, why doth Christ promise such an immense Reward to those that do forsake, and quit them for his sake? Why doth he promise, as an Encouragement to do so, the Return of them an hundred fold; since what we are not to affect, or to desire at all, of that we are not to affect or to desire the Encrease? Or why doth Peter say to Christ, *We have left all (these things) and followed thee, what shall we have?* Doth not the Question plainly suppose, That leaving of these things was that for which they might ex-

Mark 10.

29, 30.

v. 28.

expect a Recompence? Which sure they could not do for leaving only that which was not in it self desirable, which was not good, and so could be no proper Object of their Love. Wherefore by these Expressions our Saviour plainly doth instruct us that these are in some degree desirable, and proper Objects of our Love. Again, when the Psalmist, to engage Men to keep God's Commandments, saith,

Pf. 119. 10. *More to be desired are they then gold, yea, then*
 Pf. 119. 127. *much fine gold*; and testifies of himself thus, *I love thy Commandments above Gold, yea, above fine Gold*; do not these things suppose that

Pf. 63. 3. *loved*? When he saith, *Thy loving kindness is*
 Pf. 119. 72. *better then life it self*: And again, *The Law of thy mouth is better unto me then thousands of gold and silver*. When the Wise Man commends

Wisdom to us, by saying, *Wisdom is better then Rubies, and all the things that may be desired are not to be compared to it*. Doth not the Comparison shew that these things in their kind are good? Doth it not suppose that there be many things that may be desired? In fine, when

Mat. 10. 37. Christ declares, *That he who loveth Father or Mother, Wife or Children, or even his own Life, more then him, is not worthy of him*; does not he tacitly suppose that 'tis as natural to love, and to desire the Continuance of Life, as to love Father and Mother; and that this Love is only Vicious when it exceeds or rivals that Affection which we owe to him?

§. 4.

3. God threatens, to deter Men from their Sins, That he would, as a token of his Indignation, deprive them of these temporal Good things,

things, That they should then be *curfed in their basket. and store, in the fruit of their body, of their land, of their kine and Sheep*: That they should *serve their Enemies in hunger, and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all things*; and that the Lord would *rejoyce over them to destroy them, and to bring them to nought*. That he would *inflict upon them his sore judgments, the sword, the pestilence, the noysome beast, and the famine*. Now, if Life, Plenty, and the Fruits of the Earth, their Kine, and Sheep, were not good and desirable things, wherein consists the Curse, and the *sore Judgment* in being thus deprived of them? Or why doth Solomon so earnestly desire, That God, upon their Prayer, and their Repentance, would grant Deliverance from the forementioned Evils?

Deut. 28. 17. 18.

v. 48.

v. 63.

Ezek. 14. 21.

2 King. 8.

36, 37, &c.

Again, this is one of God's Motives to engage his People to depart from evil, That *their iniquities withheld good things from them*, That *therefore were the showers withheld, and the latter rain fail'd*; That *therefore the Heaven over them was staid from dew, and the earth was staid from her fruit*. Now, if these temporal Enjoyments were not indeed good things, why is the withholding of them stiled the withholding of good things from them? If they were not fit Objects of Desire, where is the punishment in the withdrawing them? or where is the motive to depart from evil, that they might prevent these things?

Jer. 5. 25.

Jer 3. 3.

Hag. 1. 10.

4. God hath sufficiently informed us, That these things are truly good for, and fit to be desired by us, by declaring, That they are his Blessings,

§ 5.

1 Chron. 29. Blessings, his peculiar Gifts : That riches and bo-
 12. nour come of him, That he giveth corn, and wine,
 Hof. 8. 2. and oyl, and that his blessing maketh rich, and
 Pro. 10. 22. that he giveth power to get wealth; That the
 Deut. 8. 18. enjoying of the Good of all our Labour is the
 Eccl. 3. 13. Gift of God; That God Gives to Man, not only
 ch. 5. 19. riches and wealth, but also power to eat thereof,
 to take his portion, and to rejoice in the fruits of
 his labour, and that this is the Gift of God; and
 that 'tis from the Hand of God that we enjoy
 the Good of all our Labour: But if none of the
 fruits of our Labour be our Good, how can
 we enjoy the Good of all our Labour, or
 why should we rejoyce in them? Can we
 more effectually depreciate his Gifts, or un-
 dervalue his Blessings, than by saying that there
 is nothing in them which deserves to be esteem-
 ed our Good, or ought to be desired of those
 that love him.

Moreover, how positive soever these Meta-
 physical Men are, that these are not our Goods,
 the holy Scripture is as positive to the contra-
 ry; For in the Story of Lot, we have twice
 mention of his Goods; in the History of Jacob,
 Gen. 14. 12, 16. that he carried away all his Goods. St. Luke
 Gen. 31. 18. saith, Of him that taketh away thy goods ask them
 Luk. 6. 30. not again. He introduceth the Rich man, say-
 ing, there will I bestow all my fruits and my Goods.
 Luk. 12. 18. He introduceth Abraham saying to Dives, Son,
 Luk. 16. 25. remember that thou in thy life time receivest thy
 good things: And Zacheus, saying, Half of my
 Luk. 19. 8. goods I give unto the poor. Though I give all my
 goods to relieve the poor, and have not Charity, I
 1 Cor. 13. 3. am nothing, saith St. Paul: And he commen-
 Heb. 10. 34. deth the believing Jews, for taking joyfully the
 spoiling of their goods. All which things plain-
 ly

ly shew that in the Language of the holy Ghost, whatever *Metaphysicks* may say to the contrary, these outward Blessings were their Goods. Moreover, the wise Man frequently informs us, That it is the Good of man to eat and drink, and make his soul enjoy the good of all his labour.

Eccl. 2. 24,
3. 12, 13. 22.
ch. 5. 18, 19.
ch. 8. 15.

That this is his Portion. To receive them, is to receive good at the hand of God, Job 2. 10. to be filled with them, is to be filled with goodness, Psal. 107. 9. Jer. 31. 14. to use them freely, is to fill our soul with good, Eccl. 6. 3. to promise these things, is to promise good to them, Deut. 30 9. Jer. 32. 42. to give them, is to do them good, Jer. 33. 9. to deny them to our selves, is to bereave our souls of good, Eccl. 4. 8. and to withhold them from the Poor, is to withhold good from him to whom it is due, Pro. 3. 27. All which Expressions are a perfect Demonstration, That these temporal Enjoyments are, in the Language of the Scripture, our Good things, and therefore may be loved and desired as our Goods. Moreover, the Apostle makes the giving of these temporal Blessings to the Heathen World the Testimony of God's Goodness to them; He hath not, saith he, left himself without a Witness, *ἀντιμαρτυρῶν*, doing them good, in giving them rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness. This also by our Saviour is represented as a Demonstration of God's Love to all, That he maketh his Sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just, and on the unjust. By this he sheweth himself kind to the unthankful, and to the evil. They therefore who do absolutely deny that these

Act. 14. 17.

Mat. 5. 45.

Luk. 6. 35.

these are our good things, *i. e.* things which do good to us, they leave God without a Witness of his Goodness to the Heathen World, and weaken the Engagement laid upon us, from this Example of our God, to love our Enemies, and to do good to them. And,

§ 6.

Fifthly, As a just Consequence of this, God hath enjoyed us to reioyce in them, and so to return the Tribute of our Praises and Thanksgivings to the Author of them. For *thou*, saith God, *shalt rejoyce in every good thing which the Lord thy God hath given to thee, and thine house.* The Jews were commanded to rejoyce in all their Feasts, but in this of the First Fruits particularly, for all the good Things that Year afforded. The wise Man, after all that he had said touching the Vanity of the Creature, concludes, *There is nothing better for a man, than that he should eat, and drink, and make his Soul enjoy good, or delight himself in the fruits of his labour,* Eccles. 2. 24. and *rejoyce in his own works,* ch. 3. 13, 22. And for neglect of serving God with cheerfulness and gladness of heart in the abundance of all things, *i. e.* saith the Targum of Jonathan, *לֵב טוֹב* of all good things, God threatens to the Jews, That they should serve their enemies in hunger, and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all (good) things. These things, saith the Apostle, God hath created to be received with thanksgiving; and God expecteth we should continually bless him for them, saying to his own people, *when thou hast eaten, and art full, then thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which he hath given thee. Bless the Lord, O my soul,*

Deut. 26. 11.

Deut. 28.
47, 48.

Deut. 3. 10.

soul, saith David, and all that is within me bleſs Psal. 103. 1, his holy name. Bleſs the Lord, O my soul, and for-^{2, 5.} get not all his benefits who satisfieth i by mouth with good things. And again, Bleſs the Lord, O Psal. 104. 1, my soul, for he causeth the graſs to grow for the^{14, 15.} cattle, and herb for the service of men, and wine, that maketh glad the heart of man, and oyl to make his face shine, and bread, which strengthens man's heart. Now, if Love, Praise and Service, be due unto God for these things, surely they must be good things to us, as they are represented here; if he is to be blessed for them, they must be desirable Blessings; if we are to rejoyce in them, if the abundance of them should create in us Chearfulness and Gladness of Heart, they must be a fit ground of Joy and Gladness, and so must be our Goods, since no man can rejoyce in that Enjoyment which yeilds no good to him; if from them we may make our Souls *enjoy good* and delight, and there is no better Employment we can put them to, than to enjoy them chearfully our selves, and to make others chearful by the Participation of them, must they not be our Good, and proper Objects of our Delight and Joy, much more of our Desire?

Sixthly, The Industry which God requires from us, that we may enjoy these temporal good things; the Appetites he hath implanted in us towards them, which cannot be satisfied without Industry; the Faculties he hath given us to fit us for it; the Callings he hath placed us in, and in which we can never thrive without it; and the temporal Blessings he hath promised as the Reward of our Industry; are

all

§. 7.

- all sufficient to convince us, That these temporal Enjoyments are good, and desirable things to us. Even in *Paradise* God found Employment for our Industry, requiring the Man that he had put into it to *dress it, and to keep it*, and so by Industry to sustain his Life; and to secure his Pleasure, when he was turned out thence, God laid the Burthen upon him and his Posterity, That *in the sweat of their faces they should eat their bread, till they returned unto the ground*. Under the Evangelical Dispensation, every Christian is to have his Calling, in which he must abide; he is exhorted *with quietness to work, and eat his own bread*; *and to do his own business, working with his hands*, or *working to 'vadv, that which is good, with his hands*; and if he will not labour, when he can, the Apostles Canon saith *he must not eat when he would*. Moreover, though we bring nothing into the World, yet we bring Appetites, which have no other use but to desire these Temporals, and Constitutions which cannot at all subsist, or not conveniently, without them; which therefore were undoubtedly designed to prompt us to that Industry by which alone we can obtain them. We have hands also suted for Work, and Strength enabling us to labour, and Reason to contrive how to employ that Labour in procuring the things we want. All which things shew, even without a Revelation, That Divine Wisdom did intend that we should live in the Exercise of Industry to procure these things, and not well without it; having so many Desires to be appeased, so many Wants to be supplied, so many Troubles to be removed, so many Ap-
petites

petites and Senses to be gratified by our Care and Industry, in the pursuit of these things. But now imagin these temporal Enjoyments not to our good, not proper Objects of our Desire, not worthy of the name of temporal Blessings, you cut off all Motives to this Industry; for where there is no proper Fruits of Industry, nothing which is *Opera pretium*, worth the labour, there can be no cause of Labour: Now where there is nothing good for me, nothing desirable, no Blessing to be obtained by Labour, 'tis certain that there is no ground or motive unto Labour. And therefore, to excite us to this Industry, God hath engaged to give to the diligent pursuit of these things, 1 Prosperous Success, declaring, That *the soul of the diligent shall be made fat*, whilst *the sluggard desireth, and hath nothing*; 2 Plentiful Accommodations for our Sustenance; for as *The thoughts of the diligent tend only to plenteousness*, so hath God assured him of Satisfaction from it; for he that *tilleth his Land shall be satisfied with bread*. 3. Encrease of Wealth and Riches; for tho' *the blessing of the Lord maketh rich*, yet he conveys that Blessing to us by the hand of Diligence, for 'tis *the hand of the diligent that maketh rich*; and *he that gathereth by labour, who*, saith the wise Man, *shall encrease*. Now surely that which God doth promise to us as a Blessing, and Reward for a just motive to our Industry, must be something desirable to us, and good for us, and so our good.

Prov. 13. 4.

Prov. 21. 5.

Prov. 10. 4.

Prov. 13. 11.

But had we no such evidence of these things from Scripture, even Reason and Experience would powerfully convince us.

§. 8.

C

First,

A Discourse of

First, That God hath not forbidden the Desire, or denied us the Enjoyment of any worldly Pleasure, which is truly ἡδονὴ ἀμύλα-
 μηλεις, a Pleasure that doth call for no Repentance, because his all-wise Providence hath made such liberal Provisions for them. For wherefore hath he given to us Organs capable of great and exquisite Delight in all our Senses? Wherefore hath he caused the fruitful Earth to furnish us with things so grateful to the Palat, so fragrant to the Smell, so pleasant to the Eye? Did he not give us the free use of these Enjoyments, provided that we take this freedom with Moderation and Discretion, use it with Thankfulness, and with Submission, and Subordination to the Glory of the Donor? Therein consisting our iniquity, not that we do at all love Pleasures,

2 Tim. 3. 4. but that we *love them more than God*. This is apparent to a demonstration, from the very definition of Pleasure contained in these Letters; viz. That *Pleasure is the Gratification of natural Appetites, according to, and not exceeding the intention of Nature*. For this definition takes it for granted, That the God of Nature intended the Gratification of our natural Appetites, that is, our Pleasure. Moreover what are these natural Appetites, but natural Desires? What is it that gratifies them but the Enjoyment of the thing desired? I must have therefore implanted in me by the God of Nature, as many natural Desires of the Creature, as I have natural Appetites, which may and only can be gratified by the Enjoyment of the Creature.

What therefore doth the good Lady mean when she affirms so positively, That *if he desire*

fire the Creature as the true cause of our Pleasure, it is so far from being our good, that it certainly becomes our evil. Does she mean that I sin if I desire drink, as the true cause of the pleasure that I find in quenching my Thirst; or Wine, as the true cause of making glad my Heart? This she can only mean upon the account of that new Invention of Mr. Mal Branch's, That God is the immediate and efficient Cause of all our pleasing Sensations: Now that being but an invention of yesterday, spick and span new Philosophy, not discovered till this last Age, all precedent Ages, according to this Doctrine, lay under a necessity of sinning. And so must all at present, whose heads are not cast in Metaphysical Moulds, they being thought incapable of this fine Speculation, and therefore forced still to believe the Scripture, when it saith, that *Wine maketh glad the heart of man*, and that *bread comforts his heart*. And when it speaks of *pleasant Bread*, and *pleasant Fruits*, and of *Chambers filled with all precious and pleasant Riches*, and of the *sweetness of the Honey and the Honey-comb*. Gen. 18. 5. Judg. 19. 5. Dan. 10. 3. Cant. 4. 13, 16. Prov. 24. 4.

Secondly, He cannot absolutely have forbidden the desire of Honour; for if so, why hath he planted in us such a natural thirst after it? Why doth he promise it so oft as the reward of Wisdom? Why hath he told us, *A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches*; that it is *better than the precious Ointment*? Why hath he made it our Duty to pursue whatever is *praise-worthy, honourable, and of good report*? Why hath he made it a commendation of Faith, that by it the Elders obtained a good report? Why hath he ordered matters so, as to

Prov. 22. 1.

Ecclef. 7. 1.

Philip. 4. 8.

Hebr. 11. 2.

A Discourse of

render a good Reputation, and an honourable Esteem so highly instrumental to promote his Glory, and so beneficial to our selves and others, that great and good things can scarce successfully be done without it. And,

Thirdly, As for temporal good Things; he by making such rich Provisions of them for the Sustainance of our lives, and by framing our Bodies so as not only to refresh and delight in them, but also to be nourished and sustained by them, hath sufficiently intimated that it is his pleasure that we should in reasonable measure desire and enjoy them, otherwise his care would have been vain, and his works useless; yea, he might seem to have had an ill design to tempt and ensnare us, and draw us off from himself by them. In fine, when we come into the World in the wake of all things, with Appetites which have no other use but to desire them, and cannot but be pleased with them; when we have Natures that cannot long, or conveniently subsist without them; when the Organs of our Senses are so framed, as naturally to be delighted with them; when the wise Providence of God hath framed the whole Earth for satisfaction of those Appetites; when by the Order of Providence from the Creation, all Men do pursue them, and even good Men pray unto God, and do praise him for them; can it be needful to spend more words in confutation of a Paradox, which all Men do renounce in Speculation or in Practice; or to evince that God hath not entirely forbid all love, and all desire of the World's good Things. Now hence it follows;

First,

First, That this Doctrine is inconsistent with our Obligation to pray for any temporal Blessings which we want either for our selves, or others. Whosoever looks into the Prayer of Dedication, made by *Solomon*, will find it is imploy'd in begging temporal Mercies for the *Jews* in answer to their Prayer, viz. in asking deliverance from that *Pestilence* which destroyed their Lives; that *Famine*, *Mildew*, *Blasting*, *Locust* which consumed their Fruit, that *Drought* which consumed their Drink, and that *Exile* which deprived them of that good Land which *flowed with Milk and Honey*.

The *Ancient Liturgies* pray'd always thus, *Let us beseech the Lord to give us a temperate Air, gentle Showers, refreshing Dewes, and plenty of all Fruits*; so that the year may afford us store of all good things, and abundance of all Provisions. In our Liturgy we pray that God would give and preserve to us the kindly Fruits of the Earth, so as in due time we may enjoy them: That the King may study to preserve his People in Wealth, Peace and Godliness: That we may receive the Fruits of the Earth to our comfort: That God would encrease the Fruits of the Earth by his heavenly Benediction, and turn our great Scarcity and Dearth into Plenty and Cheapness. Now, seeing Prayer is a desire of some good thing from God, if these Enjoyments be not our good things, if we may not desire or affect them, we cannot thus address unto God for them.

Secondly, This Doctrine is inconsistent with that Praise, and that Thanksgiving which we owe to God for all the Mercies we enjoy.

§. 9.

1 Kings 8.

See Dr. Comber, comp. part 2. p. 178.

A Discourse of

How often doth the Psalmist call upon us to
 Psal. 108. 8. *praise the Lord for his goodness in these things ;*
 for feeding the Hungry, relieving the Father-
 Psal. 81. 16. *less and Widow ; for feeding us with the flower*
 Ps. 147. 14. *of wheat ; for filling our mouth with good things ;*
 Ps. 103. 5. *for opening his hand, and filling all things living*
 Ps. 104. 28. *with plenteousness ?* How punctual is our Li-
 Ps. 145. 16. *turgy, in giving thanks for our Creation, Pre-*
servation, and all the Blessings of this Life ; for
sending Rain upon the Earth, that it may bring
forth fruit for the use of man to our great com-
fort ; for the relief and comfort we receive from
any seasonable and blessed Change of Weather ; for
Plenty owned as an act of God's especial
Bounty, and his loving Kindness to us ! But
how can we esteem these things the Blessings of
this Life, acts of God's special Bounty, and tes-
timonies of his loving Kindness to us, if,
by conferring them, God affords us nothing
we can or need to desire, or ought to be af-
fected with ? Ought we not highly to value,
to have a due esteem, and a due sense of di-
vine Goodness, in affording us those mercies
which thus engage our Souls to bless him, and
all that is within us to praise his holy Name ?
 And can any thing tend more to lessen this
 value and esteem for them, or to impair the
 sense of Divine Goodness in affording them,
 then thus to represent them as things which
 good Men do not need, cannot desire, and
 ought not to affect.

Thirdly, This Doctrine tends to depreciate
 the divine Gifts, to undervalue all God's tem-
 poral Blessings, to cause Men to despise and
 slight his temporal Promises, and to contemn
 his threats of the same kind, and render both
 unable

unable to obtain the ends his Wisdom hath designed in making them; for what greater contempt can we cast upon the divine Gifts? how can we more effectually vilifie the divine Blessings, or slight these Promises, than by thus solemnly declaring they contain nothing in them which a good Man can desire or affect? What motive can such Promises afford us, to *serve the Lord with cheerfulness and gladness of heart in the abundance of all things?* Deut. 28. 47, 48.

And if the temporal Evils which God threatens, are not to be valued, if they cannot deprive us of any thing which is our good, or which a pious Soul can either desire or need; why should we be afraid of them? Or what effect can they have on us to deter us from the evil of our ways? To engage us to love God only, the incomparable Lady desires us to consider, *That this is the best way to secure to us that which we are so fond of, even the Enjoyment of the Creature;* and that to fix our love warmly and entirely, *N.B. on God, is to be sure of possessing all that is good in other things.* Now, doth she not by these words confess there is some good in other things, and consequently something desirable? Why therefore doth she say, *That in all reason Creatures ought not to be thought desirable?* Hath she not told us, *That the desire of God, and the desire of the Creature in their own natures, are incompatible?* Why therefore doth she move us by this consideration, to secure to our selves what we may not desire? Doth she not add, *That he that desires any thing besides God, what ever he pretends, or however he deceive himself, doth not truly love God. And that the Soul that moves*

Let. 9. p. 181, 182.

Ibid. p. 179.

P. 201.

P. 202, 203.

toward the Creature, must necessarily forsake the Creator? Why then did she her self propose this Argument to move us to the Enjoyment, and consequently to the desire of the Creature? She did it doubtless because she found this was God's motive to seek first the Kingdom of God the Righteousness thereof, that then all things else shall be added to us; that this was his encouragement to Godliness, that it had the promise of this life. But this affords a demonstration of her mistake in all that I have quoted from her, for may we not desire what God doth promise? If then he promiseth these Creatures as the reward of Godliness, and seeking first his Kingdom, can the desire of what he thus hath promised be incompatible with the desire of God? Can we forsake the Creator, by moving towards what he thus excites us to? Can we cease truly to love God, by desiring that which he doth promise?

Fourthly, This Doctrine tends to destroy all Industry in our Calling, and all pursuit of temporal Enjoyments by our honest Labour: For let me totally withdraw every straggling desire from the Creature, and surely I shall be so kind to my self as to withdraw my labour from it. If in all reason Creatures not to be thought desirable, 't must be unreasonable to toil and labour for them, and to eat them in the sweat of our brows: If none of these Enjoyments be worth my labour, surely I have no ground to labour for them; now where there is nothing good to me, nothing desirable to be obtained by Labour, there can be nothing worth my labour.

Fifthly,

Let. 7. p.
132.

Let. 9. p.
179.

Fifthly, This Doctrine lays the vilest imputations upon the dispensations of God's Providence towards us. For it makes God encourage us to the performance of our Duty, by promising, that we cannot move towards with-
 out forsaking him, nor desire without doing
 that which is inconsistent with true love to God.
 It lays this Imputation on the Just and Holy
 God, that he hath made that our Sin which
 is natural and necessary, as sure it is to desire
 Food when we are hungry : It makes him to
 have planted in us natural Appetites, or de-
 sires which he intended we should gratifie,
 and yet hath not permitted us to desire that
 which alone can gratifie them. That he hath
 filled the Earth with his Blessings, and given
 it to the Children of Man to no end; that he
 hath caused the Herb to grow for the service of
 Man, Wine to make glad, and Bread to streng-
 then Man's heart, and yet will not permit us
 to desire that Bread which gives us strength,
 or love, i. e. be pleased with that Wine which
 maketh our hearts glad.

Why therefore doth the good Lady en-
 quire, *When shall we be so just to God, and so*
kind to our selves, as totally to withdraw every
straggling desire from the Creature! Is it justice
 to God to say, that he requires us to Pray,
 and Praise him, for what he requires us totally
 to withdraw our desires from? Has God re-
 quired as an act of Justice that we should not
 desire what he, by promising as the reward
 of our Obedience, doth even count us to de-
 sire; and by those Appetites he hath implant-
 ed in us, doth even force us to desire? Is it
 kindness to our selves to *hate our own*
 as

Leit. 9. p.

203.

P. 201.

P. 208.

Pf. 115. 16.

Pf. 104. 14.

15.

P. 132.

sh, Eph. 5. 29.

as the Apostle intimates he doth, who takes not care to *nourish it*? Is it kindness to our selves not to desire for our selves that which is needful for the Body? How then can it be Charity to give that to others, which out of kindness we desire not to our own selves?

P. 147, 148, 149. Again, why doth she add, *That if we did consult either our Honour or Interest, we should abandon all other desires*; it being as unjust, so unsafe to give desire the least tendency towards any Object but him who is the only proper and adequate one.

P. 149, 150. Is it our interest not to desire Food convenient for us, or is it for our Honour to think the Blessings God hath promised not worth a wish? Can it be unjust to gratifie my natural Appetites, according to the intention of the God of Nature? Can the regular application of the Faculty of desire to such Objects as are agreeable to our Nature, be either unjust or unsafe? Why then doth she here give us this as the Definition of that Pleasure which she declares to be the grand motive to Action?

P. 159.

CHAP. II.

The Contents.

To avoid the seeming Inconsistence betwixt the Love of God only, and the love of my Neighbour as my self, it is said, That the Love of God with all our Heart enjoined in the First Commandment, is the love of Desire; the love of my Neighbour required in the Second, is only Love of Benevolence, §. 1. To take off this Evasion it is proved, First, That the Love of God required in the Injunction to love him with all our hearts, &c. cannot be discharged by a love of Desire only, but requires also a love of Benevolence, §. 2. Secondly, That though the love of our Neighbour here enjoined be not love of Desire of him as our good, yet neither is it love of Benevolence, or wishing well to him only, but to the due performance of it, a desire of the Creature is necessary, §. 3. Thirdly, That the love of our selves, our Relatives, our Neighbour, and our Friend (all which, saith Mr. N. is love of Benevolence only) is indeed that love which chiefly opposes, and obstructs our love to God, and is the rise of our inordinate Affections to the World, §. 4. Fourthly, That though the Command to love our Neighbour as our selves, doth not require us to love our Neighbour as our good, yet is not only lawful, but very commendable so to do, §. 5. This Doctrine, That the love of God is entirely exclusive of all Love to, and desire of the Creature, destroys the Foundation of these two great Virtues,

Virtues, Justice and Charity, §. 6. It also casts a great Contempt upon the Works both of Creation and of Providence, §. 7.

Argument 2. **I** Proceed now to my Second Head, viz. to shew, that this Exposition of the Precept, to love God with all our hearts, renders it contrary to the following Command, enjoining us to love our Neighbour as our selves. That this is a just Prejudice, if true, against this new Invention the Admirable Lady confesseth, and confirmeth in these words; 'It were, I confess, a strong prejudice against their way of stating the Love of God, if it were in any measure injurious to the right Understanding and due performance of the love we owe to our Neighbour. For since the Precepts of the Gospel are an exact and beautiful System of Wisdom and Perfection; every one of whose Parts are so duly proportioned to the other, that the result of all is perfect Harmony and Order. I must needs conclude, that when such a sense is put upon one Precept as causes it to clash and interfere with another, it cannot be the genuine meaning of it; and if I cannot make over the whole of my desire to God, without defaulting from that portion of love he has assigned my Neighbour, I must of necessity set the signification of that Precept to a lower pitch, and find out some other Medium to interpret the first and great Commandment. But then they think to save the matter with the distinction of love, into love of desire, and love of Benevolence; declaring that the former is due to

Let. 7. P.
135, 136.

to God alone, and is the thing required in the Commandment, *to love God with all our hearts*; the second only belongeth to our Neighbour, and is the thing enjoined in the Command, *to love our Neighbour as our selves.* Thus

Mr. N. " 'Tis most certain, that the most lett. 8. P.
 " entire love of God, enjoined in the first 154, 155,
 " Commandment, does by no means exclude 156. See P.
 " the love of our Neighbour, enjoined in 71, 72.
 " the second, in case these two loves be of
 " two different kinds; the former suppose
 " love of Desire, and the latter love of Bene-
 " volence, there being no manner of Repug-
 " nancy between the desiring none but God,
 " and the wishing well to Men. Thus, saith he,
 " is it in this case; for the word Love, when
 " applied to God in the First Command-
 " ment, signifies desiring him as a good; and
 " when applied to Men, in the Second, (it)
 " signifies not desiring them as a good, but
 " desiring good to them: And cannot I thus
 " love God only, and my Neighbour too,
 " and so fulfil both Commands? Cannot I
 " desire but one thing only in the World, and
 " yet at the same time wish well to every
 " thing else? 'Tis plain that I may, and that
 " the entireness of my love to God, does no
 " way prejudice my love to my Neigh-
 " bour; supposing the latter love to be of a
 " different kind from the former. Now in
 Answer to these Suggestions I shall endeavour
 to shew.

1st, That the Love of God required in the
 Command *to love him with all our hearts*, is
 not only a love of desire, but of Benevolence
 also.

2^{dly}, That

A Discourse of

2dly, That though the love of our Neighbour here enjoined be not *love of desire of him as our good*; yet neither is it love of Benevolence only, but that to the due performance of it a desire of the Creature is requisite, which is sufficient to confute the Hypothesis, That the love of God required in the command, To love God with all our hearts, is exclusive of the love of the Creature.

3dly, That the love of Benevolence allowed by Mr. N. and his good Lady, is indeed that love which chiefly opposeth and obstructeth our true love to God, and is the rise of our inordinate Affections to the World.

4thly, That though this Precept, *Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thy self*, cannot be well supposed to command us to desire our Neighbour as our good, yet is it not only lawfully but very commendable so to do.

§. 2.
Prop. 1.

First, Then I say, That the Love of God required in the Injunction to love him with all our Hearts, cannot be discharged by a love of Desire only, but requires also a love of Benevolence. For is the desire of Enjoying him all that he desires from us, to testify and express our love to him? Doth he not require upon this account that we should be zealous in the promotion of his Honour? That we should rejoice in every thing by which his Holy Name is Glorified? That we should promote, as much as in us lies, the advancement of Piety, and Holiness, and Righteousness, because these things are acceptable and well pleasing to him? That we should endeavour the Repen-

Luke 15. 7. tance of the Sinner, because this creates joy in Heaven,

the Love of God.

31

*Heaven, and God is highly pleased with it? Are we not therefore to be filled with the Fruits of Righteousness, because they tend to the Praise and Glory of God? Must not our Works shine before Men, that we may glorify our heavenly Father? Yea, whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do, must we not do all to the Glory of God? Should we not be grieved at, and industrious to prevent whatever tends to the Dishonour of his Holy Name? Doth he not enjoin us to do good to others for his sake? to love his House, his Ministers, his Servants, because they are related to him? and require Servants to obey their Masters, *ut dominis, with good well-doing service to the Lord*; and do we not by all these things testify our good will to God. When the Excellent Lady saith of the Divine Lover, "That where-ever his Beloved is interested, his Soul is all on Fire; he does not pursue his Service with a languid and frozen application, but with the Diligence and Zeal of Love; He will not see his Beloved affronted, his Law contemned, and his Designs opposed, and tamely stand by and hold his peace, nor does he regard what himself may suffer, but only what service he may reasonably hope to do, and never is chary of those things we usually call our own, whether Fortune, or Fame, or Life it self, but only deliberates how he may serve them for the most opportune season of spending them freely in his Beloved's Service? Doth she not in all this speak of the Love of Benevolence? Are not all these Acts of Benevolent affection to God? When we are thus zealously*

Phil. 1. 11.
 Mat. 5. 16.
 1 Cor. 10. 31.
 Eph. 6. 7.
 Lett. 11. p. 166.

zealously concerned for the Honour of our Neighbour, when we desire he may be pleased and gratified, and rejoice when he is so; and are grieved when any thing is done to his Dishonour, or by which he is much displeased; when we love any thing related to him, and treat it respectfully for his sake; do we not by these things shew our love of Benevolence to our Neighbour? Why therefore may we not be said to testify and express our good will to God, by doing the like things towards him.

Serm. 23. of the Love of God, Vol. 3. p. 316. The Excellent Dr. Barrow not only makes of it one Property of true Love to God, to bear the Love of the greatest good will towards him, but also saith, There wants not sufficient matter of exercising good will, both in Affection and Action towards God; (for) we are capable both of wishing, and in a manner, as he will interpret it, and accept it, of doing good to him by our concurrence with him in promoting those things which he approves and delights in, and in removing the contrary.

Mat. 10. 37. Moreover when Christ saith, He that loveth Father and Mother, Wife or Children, or his own Life more than me, is not worthy of me: Doth not the comparison require, that the Love mentioned should relate to the same kind of love? If then the love of Father and Mother be only that of Benevolence, and the love of God and Christ be that of Desire only, let Mr. N. tell us why they may not both be very well consistent, as well as the love of God, and of our Neighbour are upon that account believed to be so, If the love of both be that of desire, it follows, in opposition to his Grand Tenet, that

that Creatures may be loved with love of Desire; but if the love here mentioned be that of Benevolence, then is it certain that love of Benevolence is not only due to God, but also that it is due to him in an higher measure than to any Creature. And indeed this Matter needs to be explained a little, and then it will scarce need a further Confirmation

First, Then we may consider God in his Divine Essence, as an All-sufficient God, infinitely happy in himself, and incapable of any accession either to his Being, or internal Happiness; and in this sense to wish well to him, or to desire to him Good, is vain and impracticable; and therefore considered thus, he is incapable of Love of Benevolence.

But then we may consider him as the great Governor of the World, giving Laws, which he would have us to observe, and by Obedience to which he is glorified by Men, and is well pleased when they do chearfully and readily comply with them, and is dishonoured and displeased when they affront him by their Disobedience.

We also may consider him according to his immitable Perfections, and his communicable Attributes, *viz.* his Holiness and Righteousness, his Truth and Faithfulness, his Goodness and Mercy. Now these being the Excellencies and Perfections of his own Nature, which he cannot chuse but love and delight in, he is pleased to express himself as one who very much desires that all his Subjects should be like him in them, and to delight

A Discourse of

delight in all that are so, and who endeavours to make others so; he being glorified by them who promote these Excellencies in themselves, and others, and as one who is highly offended, displeased, and even grieved when Men neglect these things, and act in opposition to his great Design of promoting these Perfections in Mankind; and thus he is very capable of our Love of Benevolence: For whenever we do him service out of good will, and pure desire to please him; when we aspire to greater measures of Holiness, and Righteousness, and are Fruitful in good Works, because these things are acceptable to God, and tend to the promotion of his Glory; when we endeavour that all with whom we do converse may advance in them from the same Principle; in all these cases we express our good will to him. When we are zealous for his Honour, rejoice to see it promoted, are grieved at any thing which doth dishonour and displease him, and are industrious to prevent it; in this we shew a Zeal for God, and a displeasure against these things, arising from a love to him. And when we love his Servants for his sake, and our Neighbour, because made after the Image of God; this is in Scripture represented not only as an Indication, but an Expression of our love to him; For God is not unrighteous, saith the Apostle, to forget your labour of love, which you have shewed to his name, in that you ministered to the Saints. And forasmuch as you did it to one of these, saith Christ, you did it unto me. And therefore Crellius and Carrellæus do well inform us, That the love of God is strictly

Hebr. 6. 10.

Mat. 25. 40.

strictly and most properly taken for that affection by which we desire that those things which are grateful to God may be done by us and others: For as love to others in the General is that affection by which we desire those things to another which are good; and if that love be fervent, endeavour, as we are able, to effect it, and chiefly are concerned that he whom we love may enjoy what is grateful and profitable to him. So Charity, or Love to God, only, *N.B.* those things which, as we may say, are good, that is grateful and delightful to God, as are all those things which conduce to his Honour, or are otherwise according to his Will.

And indeed the desire of enjoying God as the chiefest good, is so natural, so deeply rooted in self-Love, that it bears an affinity to that general desire of Happiness, which Philosophers will not allow to be Virtuous, or Praise-worthy, because it is not free, but natural; but this Love of Benevolence to him is a more pure Flame, a more noble and disinterested Affection; the desire that he may be Glorified by others, and that he may not be Dishonoured by them, is the desire of that on which our Happiness doth not depend, and so it is a love which Centers upon God alone without re-

Strictissime, & maxime proprie sumitur pro affectu eo quo desideramus ut ea tum à nobis, tum ab aliis fiant quæ deo sunt Gratissima; quemadmodum enim amor erga alium in universum consideratus, est affectus ejusmodi quo ea cupimus quæ alteri sunt bona, unde sit etiam ut, si amor iste sit intensus, & fervens, pro viribus id ipsum conemur efficere, atque id unice agamus, ut is quem diligimus rebus sibi gratis, & utilibus poratur. Ita etiam Charitas, seu amor erga Deum ea unice desiderat quæ Deo, ut ita dicamus, sunt bona, hoc est grata, atque jucunda, qualia sunt omnia ista quæ honorem illi afferunt, aut alias voluntati ipsius sunt consentanea. *Cress. &c. Christian. lib. 3. cap. 4. Curcill. Instit. lib. 7. cap. 22. sect. 3.*

spect unto our selves ; it also shews a stronger compliance of our Will with the Will of God, a greater Sympathy of Affections, a stronger Complacency in Goodness, an higher Resemblance of Divine Perfections, than our desire of the chief Good imports, and so it renders us more partakers of the Divine Nature, and so more acceptable and lovely in the sight of God. Love of Benevolence is therefore due to God, as well as to my my Neighbour, and so the love of God and of Neighbour is not on that account of different kinds. And if it cannot be denied that this is true and genuine love of God, it cannot be denied that this love also is required in the Command, *To love the Lord with all our Heart, and all our Soul* ; and then it is demonstratively evident, that Phrase cannot exclude the love of any Creature, because it is confessed, that with this love of Benevolence we are to *love our Neighbour as our selves*.

- §. 3. Secondly, I add, That the Duty of Love I
 Prop. 2. owe to my Neighbour cannot be discharged by a love of Benevolence, or by wishing well to him only, but that it imports also a love of Beneficence, or a sincere endeavour of doing all the good I can to him. This is self-evident, and confessed by Mr. N. when he saith, It makes us ready not only to wish them, but to do them all the good we can ; to wish and to do well to them, to desire good to them all, and to do them good as far as we have Opportunity. And of this St. James sufficiently informs us, when he saith, That to wish well to our Brother, to wish he may be warm and cloasbed, without
 P. 162, 163. affording
 Jam. 2. 15, 16.

affording him, τὰ ὀφελήματα τὰ σωματικά, the things which are profitable to the Body, is an unprofitable piece of Charity. And yet how is it possible we should be able, or even desirous to afford him what is necessary for the Body, if we our selves may not desire the things that are so? Let us reflect upon those acts of Charity to our Neighbour, for which our Lord hath promised to us the Kingdom, and we shall easily discern we cannot do them, without desire of the Creature as their Good. For can we feed the Hungry, or give drink to the Thirsty, without desiring to have Food and Drink to give them? Can we take the Stranger in, without desiring an House in which we may receive him? Or Cloath the Naked, without desiring to have wherewith to Cloath him? 'Tis therefore certain, that we cannot discharge this Christian Duty to our Neighbour, without a desire of, and an endeavour also to enjoy the Creature, and then it must be also certain, that the Love of God is not exclusive of all love, and all desire of the Creature.

Besides, we by this Precept are obliged to *love our Brother as our selves*; now are we barely to wish well to our selves, and not desire Life, Health, Sleep, Ease, Comfort, and all the Necessaries of this present Life? If then we are to love our Neighbour as our selves, that love must certainly engage us to desire for our Brother the continuance of Life, Health, Ease and Comfort, and all the Necessaries of this present Life; and also that we may have what will enable us to minister to him in these things.

But,

Object.

Let. 8 p. 165.

“ But, saith Mr. N. “ *Our love of our selves is*
 “ not love of Desire, but Benevolence; for
 “ whosoever reflects upon the love of him-
 “ self, will presently perceive that ’tis not a
 “ desire of himself as his Good, but a desire
 “ of some Good to himself, as appears from
 “ the Vulgar Expression, *Charity begins at*
 “ *Home*; and from the Vice of Self-love, by
 “ which we mean a Craving, N. B. and seek-
 “ ing after more than comes to a Man’s share,
 “ without having any regard to the Community,
 “ or a greedy pursuit of our Private Interest, in
 “ opposition to that of the Publick.

Answer.

I Answer, Let this be granted, hath he not
 in these words said enough to destroy his
 own Hypothesis, That the Creature must
 not be desired as our Good? For if Self-love
 be a desire of something good to my self, if
 I may Crave and Seek after as much as comes
 to my Share; If I may pursue my private In-
 terest as far as I can do it, without Opposition to
 the Publick; then it will follow, that if any
 Creature can be good for me, if any portion
 of them may fall to my share, if it may be
 for my Interest to pursue any of them, I may
 so far Desire and Crave them, and then my
 Love of God cannot exclude my Love or my
 Desire of them.

2dly, Though Mr. N. saith, *’Tis most un-*
doubtedly so, that my Love of my self is not Love
of Desire: Both Scripture and Reason most
 undoubtedly declare the contrary; for Self-
 Preservation, and the continuance of Life, are
 the natural Desires of all Men: Now these
 are truly a Desire of our selves, that is of
 something of our selves which we have not
 already

already, and yet this *desire of Life, and love of Psalm 23.*
many Days, being only the desire of what ^{15, 14.}
 God doth promise as the Reward of our O-
 bedience; it is unquestionably the Desire of
 something Good for us, and so of something
 which Self-love doth prompt us to desire.
 When *Christ* requires us to love him more
 than Life it self, and God enjoins his People
 to obey his Precepts, *that they may live*, do not
 all these things teach us, That the continu-
 ance of Life is a thing desirable, and that we
 may *love many days*? Now this only Happi-
 nels to be the desire of some Good to us, be-
 cause the desire of our selves, *i. e.* of the
 continuance of our Being is the desire of some
 Good to us, and is at once the desire of our
 selves, and the continuance of Good; that
 is, of Being to our selves. And this we learn
 from Mr. N. himself in these very Letters,
 whereof he saith, That *since our Being is in* ^{Lett. 6. p.}
it self a Good, and the Foundation of all the Good ^{121.}
that we do, or shall ever enjoy, it can be no
sooner received than it brings an Obligation of
loving our Creator: For if our Being is *in it*
self a Good, must it not be our Good? Must
 not the continuance of it be the continuance
 of our Good? Doth it not therefore lay an
 Obligation on us to love our Creator, be-
 cause we by receiving it have received Good
 from him? And if our Being is the Being of
 our selves, must not the love of it be the love
 of our selves? and the desire of the continu-
 ance of it, be the desire of the continuance
 of our selves.

Deut. 6. 14.
 ch. 30. 15.

§. 4. *Thirdly, That the love of Benevolence is indeed that love which chiefly opposeth and obstructeth our true love to God, and is the rise of our inordinate Affections to the World, is also very evident. For,*

Serm. of Self-love, p 309, 310.

1. That the love of our selves is love of Benevolence, he and this Lady have informed us. Now "*This, saith the Excellent Dr. Barrow, is the Root from which all other Vices do grow, and without which hardly any Sin could subsist*; the chief Vices especially have an obvious and evident dependance upon it.

" All Impiety doth involve a loving our selves in undue manner and measure, so that we set our selves in our Esteem and Affection before God; we prefer our own Conceits to his Judgment and Advice; we raise our Pleasure above his Will and Authority.

" From hence particularly, by a manifest Extraction, are derived those chief and common Vices, Pride, Ambition, Envy, Avarice, Intemperance, Injustice, Uncharitableness, Peevishness, Stubbornness, Discontent, and Impatience. For,

" We overvalue our selves, our Qualities and Endowments, our Powers and Abilities, our Fortunes and external Advantages; hence we are so Proud, that is, so Lofly in our Conceits, and Fastuous in our Demeanors.

" We would be the only Men, or most considerable in the World; hence are we Ambitious; hence continually, with unsatiable greediness, we do affect and strive
" to

“ to procure encrease of Reputation, of
“ Power, of Dignity.

“ We would engross to our selves all sorts
“ of good Things in the highest degree ;
“ hence enviously we become jealous of the
“ Works and Virtue we grudge, and repine
“ at the Prosperity of others, as if they de-
“ falked somewhat from our Excellency, or
“ did Eclipse the brightness of our Fortune.

“ We desire to be not only full in our En-
“ joyment, but free and absolute in our Do-
“ minion of Things, not only secure from
“ needing the Succour of other Men, but in-
“ dependant in regard to God's Providence :
“ Hence are we so covetous of Wealth ; hence
“ we so eagerly scrape it, and so carefully
“ hoard it up.

“ We can refuse our dear selves no satis-
“ faction, although unreasonable and hurtful,
“ therefore we so greedily gratifie sensual Ap-
“ petites in unlawful, or excessive Enjoy-
“ ments of Pleasure.

“ Being blinded or transported with fond
“ Dotage on our selves, we cannot discern,
“ or will not regard what is due to others :
“ Hence are we apt, upon occasion, to do
“ them wrong.

“ Love to our selves doth in such manner
“ suck in, and swallow up our Spirits ; doth
“ so pinch in, and contract our Hearts ; doth,
“ according to its Computation, so confine
“ and abridge our Interests, that we cannot
“ in our Affection, or in real expreffion of
“ Kindness tend outwards, that we can afford
“ little good Will, or impart little Good to
“ others.

“ Deeming

A Discourse of

“ Deeming our selves extreamly Wise, and
 “ worthy of Regard; we cannot endure to
 “ be contradicted in our Opinion, or cross’d
 “ in our Honour: Hence, upon any such
 “ Occasion, our Choler riseth, and easily
 “ we break forth into violent Heats of Pas-
 “ sion.

“ From the like Causes it is that we can-
 “ not willingly stoop to due Obeisance of
 “ our Superiours, in Reverence to their Per-
 “ sons, and Observance of their Laws, that
 “ we cannot contentedly acquiesce in the
 “ Station or Portion assigned us by Provi-
 “ dence, that we cannot patiently support
 “ our Condition, or accept the Events be-
 “ falling us.

“ In fine, if surveying all the several kinds
 “ of naughty Dispositions in our Souls, and
 “ of Miscarriages in our Lives, we do scan
 “ their particular Nature, and search into
 “ their Original Causes, we shall find inor-
 “ dinate Self-love to be a main Ingredient,
 and a common Source of them all.

In particular, the love of Life, which is
 by them esteemed Love of Benevolence, to
 what base Fears, and sordid Actions doth it
 not expose us? How many myriads have lost
 their Reputation, Honesty, their Consci-
 ence, and their own Souls to save it? This
 therefore is that piece of Self-denial so oft in-
 culcated, so vehemently pressed in Scripture,
 that we may continue *Christ’s Disciples*, and
 may be Faithful to him to the Death. The
 immoderate love of it being that which is
 especially pronounced inconsistent with the
 love of God, and with Fideliry to Christ.

Hence

Hence he so often saith, *He that findeth his own Life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.* And if any Man come to me, and hateth not his own Life, he cannot be my Disciple. Can therefore any Person doubt whether this self-love, this love of Life, be not as much forbid by the Command of loving God with all our Hearts; as the desire of Houses, Lands, or any temporal Possessions, or think it less obstructive of, or inconsistent with it, because it is love of Benevolence? But will Mr. N. or his Good Lady, by reason of the mischievous Effects of this Self-love, this love of Life, perswade the World that no Man ought to love himself at all, or desire at all the Preservation of his Life? And yet would they be pleased to revise their Arguments, and those especially which are taken from the Consideration of the Danger of the Love of the Creature, they would soon perceive they were of equal Force against all love of our selves, and of our lives.

Again, the love of Parents, Children, Husbands, Wives, Relations, Friends, is love of Benevolence; and yet it is the Root of many and great Vices, it is that which renders it exceeding difficult to obey the Laws of Christ, when they once come in Competition with these Beloved's of our Souls; for where there is by Nature the closest Union, and the most intimate Affection, it must be very difficult to burst these Bonds asunder, and disengage our Hearts from them. Hence that great Duty of Self-denial is still expressed by loving God more than these; for, *He, saith* Τὸ πρῶτον. *Christ, that loveth Father and Mother, Son or* *Daughter* Mat. 10. 37.

A Discourse of

Daughter more than me, is not worthy of me.
 And by a comparative hatred of them, for,
 Luke 14. 26. *He, saith Christ, that hateth not Father and*
Mother, Wife and Children, Brothers and Si-
sters — cannot be my Disciple.

Moreover, doth not Experience convince us, that from the excessive love we bear to our Relations, beloved Sects and Parties, mostly proceeds that Strife, Debate and Variance, those Quarrels and Contentions, that Wrath, Hatred, Envy, Bitterness of Spirit; those Schisms, Factions and Seditions; those Animosities and Heart-burnings; those Calumnies, Detractions, rash Censures, which are in the World?

Is not this one great Root of that Avarice, that scraping for the World, that hoarding of it up, that want of Charity we complain of that Men are very desirous to advance their Families, and leave them in great Plenty and Splendor in the World?

Can it be therefore doubted, Whether this love of Benevolence be one great thing forbidden in this Injunction, *To love the Lord with all our Heart, &c.* or whether it be not inconsistent with it as that love of the Creature, of *Houses, Lands*, joined with it in the Text; which Men do often part with to preserve the Life of these Beloveds? But will Good Mr. N. or the Lady, hence conclude, That *the Love of God with all our Hearts*, is entirely exclusive of all Love of Benevolence to Father or Mother, Wife or Children?

S. 5. *Fourthly, That though this Precept thou shalt*
 Prop. 4. *love thy Neighbour as thy self cannot be reason-*
ably

ably supposed to command us to desire our Neighbour as our Good ; yet is it not only lawful, but very commendable so to do. I say, the Command to love our Neighbour cannot be a Command to desire him as our Good, because the love of my Neighbour is this love of another as such, the wishing well, and doing good to another, without a formal respect to my self ; whereas loving another as a Good to me, is properly Self-love. The true reason then why I cannot love my Neighbour in the Sense here required, *with love of desire as a Good to me*, is not because he is a Creature, for I my self am a Creature, and yet may love my self, as I have proved, with a love of Desire ; and I may love and desire those temporal good Things God hath promised, though they be only Creatures ; but because whatsoever I thus love, must be affected, and desired from Self-love, and not from love unto another.

Nevertheless, it is very evident that I may, and sometimes ought to desire my Neighbour as a Good to me. For, is there not such a thing as a good Friend, a good Companion, a good Neighbour, a good Counsellor ; and may not I want, and so have reason to desire this Friend, Companion, Neighbour, Counsellor, as a Good to me ? Are not such Persons very needful and beneficial to us in this Life ? And will not Self-love teach us to desire what is so needful and so beneficial to us ? May not the Parish of B. desire that Mr. N. may continue their Minister, as being a Good to them ? When Great and Good Men are in danger to be taken from us by Sicknefs, or the Casualties of War, how heartily do we
pray

- pray for the continuance and preservation of their Lives? And do we not desire this as a publick Good? And when we grieve for them as dead, and gone into a State of Happiness, can we do this out of Benevolence to them? Or, do we not so from the Sense of our own Loss of one so good, and so desirable to us? Did not *Joash* weep over *Elisha*, because he was *the Chariot of Israel*, and the *Horsemen thereof*? Did not all *Judah* and *Jerusalem* mourn for *Josiah*, because they said, *Under his shadow we shall live among the Heathens*? Are not Good and Righteous Men the greatest Blessings to a Nation, and may we not then desire the continuance and encrease of them as our Good? Does not the *Psalmist* speak of God's Saints and Servants, as *the Excellent in whom was, כִּלְיָהוּ, all his desire*? Does not *Mr. N.* say, *There are some things which I love with great Passion, such as are Conversation with select Friends*? Is not *Vir desiderii*, the Scripture Expression, for a Person highly beloved? And may not *Madam B.* and *Madam F.* be to the Lady, *Mulier desiderii*? What, though they cannot supply our Wants, yet if they can supply any of them, our want of good Company, Instruction, Learning, Knowledge, Health, may they not be desired on that account? What though they must seek their Felicity abroad, and cannot be their own chief Good, can this authorize us wholly to withdraw our Hearts from our Neighbour, or from a faithful Friend, who is better to us than a Brother, and never to desire any Conversation with him for our Good? 'Tis therefore evident from these Considerations, That
- 2 Kings 13.
14.
2 Chron.
35. 24.
Lam. 4. 20.
Psal. 16. 3.
Contempl. and
Love, p. 307.
Dan. 9. 23.
Lett. 7. p.
133.
P. 134.
Prov. 18. 24.

That we may not only desire Good to our Neighbour, but that we may also desire him as a Good to us.

§ 6.

Thirdly, I add, that this Opinion, That the Love of God is absolutely exclusive of all love to, and all desire of the Creature, destroys the whole Foundation of these two great Virtues, Justice and Charity : For,

1. This is the natural Foundation of all Justice, *Thou shalt do to others, as thou wouldst be dealt with*. If then the love of God obligeth me to have no love, and no desire of the Creature, it must oblige me to have no desire to preserve my own Life, my Health, my Goods, my Wife, my Servant, or any other Creature that is mine ; and then no Obligation can be laid upon me from this Rule of Christ, To desire to preserve the Life, Health, Goods, Relations of my Neighbour, or any other thing that is his. Nor if I suffer them to be impair'd, can I have any inward Sense, that I do that to others which I would not have done unto my own self.

2. All Charity, or Love unto my Brother, depends upon this Precept, *Thou shalt love thy Brother as thy self*. Now if this love to my self doth naturally produce within me a desire of all things that will do me good, *i. e.* a desire of the continuance of my Being, and so of all things necessary to my Being ; a desire of Ease, when I lie under Pain ; of Supplies, when under Want ; of Comfort, when I am in Trouble ; of Pleasure, when I may innocently enjoy it : In a word, a desire

fire of every thing by which I may receive Advantage, Comfort, Honour and Delight, then must my Obligation to love my Neighbour as my self engage me to desire all those Creature-Comforts by which I am enabled to do him Good. But if, as these *Philosophers*

Lett. 6. p. 126.

inform us, *The Love of God is exclusive of all love of, and consequently all desire of, the Creature. If he that loves God as he ought, as he cannot, so he need not love; and therefore not desire any thing else. If he be obliged in Ju-*

Lett. 7. p. 132.

stice to God, and in kindness to himself to withdraw every straggling desire from the Creature;

Lett. 9. p. 179. P. 201.

if Creatures ought not to be thought desirable; if the desire of God, and of the Creature, are in their own Natures incompatible, then can no true lover of God desire any of those Creatures whereby he may be able to do good unto his Brother; and so he never can be able to perform those acts of Charity and Beneficence this love unto his Neighbour doth require,

Lett. 7. p. 139.

though he hath no Temptations to these Sins which, otherwise, obstruct his Benevolence to him.

§. 7.

Fourthly, By stretching this Commandment to an exclusion of all desire of, or affection to, the Creature, a great Contempt is cast upon the works, both of the Creation and of Providence. For,

I. As to the Works of the Creation, they are generally and truly said to be a Declaration, not only of the Power and Wisdom, but of the Goodness of God; but if there be not one of all his Works which is good to us, and so our good, not one of them we should

should desire or love; that is, be pleased with, what Indication can they afford of Divine Goodness to us? *Moses* informs us, That God Gen. 1. 4. saw every thing that he had made, and beheld it was very Good. The Hebrew word, saith Mr. Ainsworth, is extended to that which is goodly, fair, sweet, pleasing, profitable, commodious, and causing Joy.

The word טוב, saith Schindler, *Non tam bonum esse substantialiter, quam amabile, volupe, jucundum, utile, & gratum, esse significat.* Accordingly it, by the Septuagint, is rendred, ἁπλῶς καλὸς καὶ χρηστὸς αἰσθη-
τὸς καὶ ἀρετὸς & τὸ συμφέρον.

Good. Not only Metaphysically, as Mr. N. imagines, *Serm. p. 62.* but as being what God designed them, profitable and delightful to Man.

And wherein doth the Goodness of these things consist, but in their fitness to serve the ends for which these Creatures were created? Now is it the Herb only, which was created for the Service of Man; was not the Host of Heaven made to give him Light, and Heat, and benign Influences, and for Signs, and for Seasons, and for Days, and for Years? Was not the Earth made to be inhabited by him? Was it not given to the Children of Men for their use? Was not the Air made for him to breath in, the Fire to warm him, the Water to afford him drink? Were not the living Creatures given him for Food, as the Herb? The Ox, the Ass, the Horse for Travel and for Tillage of the Earth; the Flocks and Herds, to feed and clothe him? The Fruits of the Earth to sustain him? The Corn, Wine and Oil to comfort and make glad the Heart of Man? Are not all these things made in such an Order and Dependance by Di-

Gen. 1. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

Gen. 9. 2, 3.

vine Wisdom, as that the Influence of the Heavens should render the Earth fruitful ; and that the fruitful Earth should yield her Corn, and Wine, and Oil, and these should minister to the Support and Comfort of Man's Life ? Is not this the true import of that Promise, *The Heavens shall bear the Earth, and the Earth shall bear the Corn, and Wine, and Oil, and they shall bear Israel ?* When the Psalmist calls upon the Sun, and Moon, the Heavens, and the Waters that are above the Heavens, the deeps, and the Whales swimming in them ; the Mountains and Hills, fruitful Trees and Cedars, the Beasts and Cattel, creeping things and flying Fowl to Praise God ; doth he not in effect invite and stir up Man to praise God for the Benefit he hath received from these things, and for the kindness God designed to him by them ? Now if there be nothing in the whole System of the Creation which is our Good, which we may love, *i. e.* be pleased with and desire, how came these Creatures to be stiled *very Good* ; and that in reference to one great end of their Creation, the Service of Man ? Wherein consists the kindness of God designed in Creation of them ? And whence ariseth the Obligation to such Praises and Thanksgivings for them ?

Moreover the same *Moses* informs us, That
 Gen. 2. 18. God created the Woman to be an *help meet*
 ch. 1. 28. for the Man, because it was not good for Man to be alone ; and that he Blessed them both, and said, *Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the Earth.* Now is there comfort in the Society of a Bosom Friend, nothing desirable in a help meet for the Necessities and Uses of this

this present Life ; or may I not desire what is so comfortable, and so helpful ? If it be *better to marry than to burn*, must it must not be good to desire a Wife, that I may not burn ? If it be a Blessing to be Fruitful, and an Infelicity and Judgment to be Barren, may I not, when I have a Wife, desire Children by her, because they are Creatures ?

1 Cor. 7. 9.

The Providence of God respects his Preservation, and his Government of all things, and with relation to both these we have have just cause to say, *The Earth is full of the goodness of the Lord*. For he preserveth Man and Beast ; and this he doth by giving and continuing to them Life and Breath, and all things. Hence, to the memory of God's great Goodness, the Psalmist hath declared, *That the eyes of all things wait upon him, and he giving them their meat in due season. He openeth his hand, and filleth all things living with plenteousness*. On this account he is by the Apostle said, *Not to have left himself without a witness of his Philanthropy, ἀνθρωπιῶν, by doing good to all in giving them fruitful Seasons, and filling their hearts with Food and Gladness*. Now if the giving Life, and all things needful to sustain it ; if the filling all things living with plenteousness, and our Hearts with Food and Gladness, be not giving us any thing that is our good, any thing we may love, or be pleased with, any thing we should desire, or move towards, wherein consists the great goodness of all these Acts of Preservation ?

Psal. 33. 5.

Psal. 145. 9.
15, 16.

Acts 14. 17.

As for the other Act of Providence, God's Government of Mankind, who knows not that the great Objection made against it both

- by *Jew* and *Heathen* was this, That it so often hapned to the *Wicked* to abound in temporal good Things, and to the *Good* to be afflicted with great *Misery* and *Want*; That such
- Pfal.* 73. 7, 12. was the *Prosperity* of the *wicked*, that their eyes stood out with fulness, and they had more than heart could wish; that they prospered in the world, and encreased in *Riches*; That the way of the *wicked* prospered, and they were happy who dealt very
- Jer.* 12. 1. treacherously: That they continued to old age, mighty in power, safe from fear, free from the rod of God, spending their days in mirth and
- Pfal.* 73. 14. wealth. Whereas many were the afflictions of the *Righteous*, they being plagued all the day long, and chastened every morning. That there is a just man who perisheth in his righteousness, and there is a wicked man that prolongeth his life in his wickedness. That there be just men to whom it hap-
- Eccles.* 7. 15. 14. peneth according to the work of the wicked. Again, there be wicked men to whom it hapneth according to the work of the righteous. Now had it not been generally received as a certain truth, that these external things were our Good, that they were proper Objects of our Desire and Affection, and that the want of them was the want of what was good and fit to be desired, there could have been no foundation for this Objection against Providence. Whence it is evident, that the Opinion which represents the Creature as no fit Object of our Desire and Affection, and denies them to be our Good, doth contradict the general Judgment of Mankind.

CHAP. III.

The Contents.

The ordinary Exposition of these Words, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c. laid down in the Words of Mr. N. and of the Schoolmen, viz, That we are obliged by them to love God above all Things; 1. Appretiatively. 2. Comparatively. 3. Intenfively. And, 4. So as to love other things only by way of Relation, and Subordination to God, §. 1. That our Lord Chrift hath approved of this Exposition is shewed, §. 2. The Censure which Mr. N. gives of this Opinion, and the Abettors of it, reflects very unbecomingly upon all the Prelates and Pastors of the Church of England, which are not of his Mind, and lays unworthy Imputations on them, §. 3. Some General Considerations offered to engage him to abate somewhat of his Confidence, and his Censorious Reflections for the future, §. 4. Especially this, that they who adhere to the common Exposition of these words, differ no more from him, than he differs from his former self, §. 5. The common Exposition further confirmed; First, From this Consideration, That this Command was given to the Jewilh Nation, whose Promises were chiefly Temporal, and therefore could not be exclusive of the desire of Temporal Blessings, §. 6. That therefore it ought to bear that Sense, which is the certain Import of the like Phrases in all the Old Testament, where they are only

A Discourse of

only to be found, which Sense is plainly opposite to that which Mr. N. contends for, §. 7. The true Sense of loving God with all the Heart and Soul in the Old Testament, shew'd from that primary Relation, and respect it hath to their owning God to be the true God, in opposition to all strange God's, §. 8. Secondly, From this Consideration, that this love is required as the Condition of Salvation, §. 9. Thirdly, That to love God with all our Mind cannot bear this Sense, §. 10. The common Exposition serves all the designs of Religion in General, and of Christian Religion in Particular, as well as the Exposition of Mr. N. and the Lady, §. 11.

HAVING thus establish'd, and confirmed this Proposition, *That it is lawful to have some love for, and some desire of the Creature, and shew'd that the love of God cannot be entirely exclusive of all love, or all desire of the Creature as our Good, I now proceed to answer what is offer'd to the contrary from Scripture, and from Reason. And,*

§. I. *First, The great Objection insisted on from Scripture ariseth from the words of Christ,*
 Mat. 22. 37. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. Now to fix the true sense of these words I shall*

1st, Lay down the ordinary Exposition of them, and offer some Arguments to confirm it.

2^{dly}, I shall consider and confute the Novel Exposition of Mr. N. and answer what he

he offers against the commonly received Interpretation.

Now the ordinary Exposition of these words, saith Mr. N. is by the generality of Divines express'd thus, (1st,) "That we are to love *Vol. 3. p. 5.*

"God with a superlative Affection, so as to
 "be ready always to prefer his Favour be-
 "fore all other things; to chuse to obey him,
 "rather than man; to please him, rather
 "than to gratifie our selves; to enjoy him,
 "rather than any carnal Interest whatsoever;
 "and so as to be ready, rather to lose any
 "temporal good, or suffer any temporal Evil,
 "than commit the least Sin against him.
 "(2^{dly},) That we are to love other things
 "only in a way of Relation and Subordina- *Ibid. p. 75.*
 "tion to God; for seeing God requires us to
 "love him with all our hearts, our love to
 "other things must be derived from, and
 "dependant on our love to God, and we
 "must only love them for his sake, as they
 "relate unto him, or as they enable us to
 "serve him, or as they are instrumental to
 "the Enjoyment of him. This by the *School-*
men, and *Systematical Divines*, is thus ex-
 pressed.

First, That we are to love God above all things *Appretiative*, i. e. so as to prize him in our Judgments above all things; to esteem him more valuable in himself, more beneficial to us than all things else we can enjoy, according to that saying of the *Psalmist*, *Tby loving kindness is much better than is Life it self*; to esteem him as the only Felicity of our Immortal Souls; their chief and most desirable Good, the only Being in whom is

Psal. 63. 3.

perfect Rest, entire Complacency, and full Satisfaction to be found, and consequently to look on all things else as *Loss* and *Dung* compared to him. And whilst we retain this value for him, we can never prize or be concerned for any thing so much as for his Favour, nor refuse to part with any thing which tendeth to deprive us of it, we can never value any other thing so much as to permit it to rival him who is exceedingly more precious in our Eyes, and more desirable to our Souls, and so we cannot overvalue any worldly thing. This therefore may be truly stiled the loving him with all our Mind.

Secondly, That we are to love God above all things *Comparative*, i. e. with a superlative Affection, so as to be ready always to prefer his Favour before all other things. And this Affection, this cleaving of our hearts unto him, must follow from the forementioned Estimation of him: For if we fully are convinced that there is infinitely more Excellency in God, more Happiness to be expected from him, than all the Honours, Pleasures, Profits, Interests, Relations, and Satisfaction of the World can tender, and so the highest reason that he should always be preferred before them; and that we should still cleave unto him, in opposition to any other thing: 'Tis certain he can have no rival in our hearts, nothing that stands in competition for our love, nothing we do not truly hate, and despise comparatively to his Favour; nothing that can tempt us to depart from him, or to do the thing which will hazard his Favour, or provoke his Displeasure; and may
we

we not then be said to love him with an entire and undivided heart ?

Thirdly, That we are to love God above all things *Intensively*, that is, our desires must be more ardently enclined towards his Favour, and the Enjoyment of him ; we must long, thirst, and pant more after him, rejoice more in his Favour than in any other thing, be more concerned to retain it than to secure any worldly Blessing, and be more satisfied in it than in Marrow and Fatness ; and what more can the love of God with all our Souls import ? For seeing such a prevalence of our Desires towards him, and Delight in him, will not permit us to desire any thing in opposition to him, or against his Will and Pleasure ; but will constrain us to quit all other Interests, that we may happily retain our Interest in him, we thus desire and delight in above all other things : It follows, that by thus loving God with all our Souls, our love unto, or our desire of the Creature, can never be inordinate or irregular, and so can never be offensive to God, and then it cannot be forbidden by the Command, *To love the Lord our God with all our Souls ?*

In these things seems to be implied, or from them certainly will follow that endeavour above all things to please him ; that industrious care to serve and to obey him ; that vigorous Employment of all our other Faculties in his Service, which will demonstrate, that we comparatively do not labour *for the Meat that perisheth*, do not permit our Secular Employments, or our pursuit of any temporal Enjoyments to impair our diligence in the

A Discourse of

the securing our eternal Interests ; and therefore that in the true import of the Phrase, we love God with all our might, all other Senses of it being inconsistent with that Diligence in our Callings, and that Industry in our Civil Affairs which God himself requires from us. And,

Fourthly, Hence it follows, that we are to love all other things only in way of Relation and Subordination to God ; for if we do co-ordinately love any other thing, we love it equally with God. And certainly if God requires us to love him with all our Hearts, and all our Souls, our love to other things must virtually be comprised in our love to God, or be independant on it, or subservient to it, or else we must deprive him of some portion of the Heart he wholly calls for.

Moreover God being our ultimate and chiefest Good, all other things can only be Good, as they conduce to the Enjoyment or Service of him, and so are to be loved by him ; that is, we must love them as they relate to him, as they enable us to serve him, as they are, or may be Instrumental to his Glory, or to our Enjoyment of him. When therefore we desire the Creature only for God's sake, *viz.* that we may have Food and Rayment to sustain that Life we have devoted to his Service. Encrease of temporal Enjoyments, that we may be more able to feed Christ's hungry, and clothe his naked Members, or more engaged to serve him *with Joy and Gladness*
of

Cum autem ait toto corde, tota anima, tota mente nullam viam nostrae partem Reliquit qua vacare debeat, & quasi locum dare ut alia revelit frui, sed quicquid aliud diligendum venerit in animum illuc rapiatur quo totius dilectionis impetus currit. Aug. de Doctr. Christian. l. 1. cap. 22.

of Heart for the abundance of all things, when we desire Marriage, or a Wife, that we may not burn; and Children, that, as Plato saith, we may breed them up in the Fear and Nurture of the Lord, and leave behind us a Race of *Παῖδες* pious Persons, who may do him service, when we *παύσωμεν* are dead and gone; and Honour, that we may *τιμωμεθα* be more instrumental to promote his Glory, *καὶ ἀγαθὰ* and to do Good to others; and lastly, the *ἐπιστήμη* Knowledge of the Creature, that we may *διδύμεν* learn to Glorifie the Creator, by viewing the *De* Power, Wisdom, and Goodness he hath discovered in the Creation of them; who sees not that this love of the Creature centers in the love of God, and tends expressly to his Glory, and therefore cannot be forbidden by this Command to love the Lord with all our Hearts, and all our Souls?

Leg. l. 6. p. 869. F.

And of this Exposition of these Words we cannot reasonably doubt, if we consider that our Lord himself doth plainly seem to favour and approve of it, making that Service, and so that Love which he requires from us, to consist in that prevalence of Affection which enables us, in any competition betwixt the love of the World, and the love of Him, to cleave to God, and despise the World. This evidently is the import of these words, No *Mark 6. 24.* Man can serve two Masters (when their Services and Commands do interfere) for he will either hate the one, and love the other, he will cleave to the one, and despise the other; ye cannot (therefore) serve God and Mammon. Mr. N. indeed saith, "Here we are plainly told we cannot *Serm. p. 64,* divide between God and the Creature, be- 65. " cause

A Discourse of

" cause we cannot love either of them but
 " upon such a Principle as must utterly ex-
 " clude the love of the other. But, 1st. the
 word *Mammon* doth not signifie the Creature
 in general, but Riches and Money in parti-
 cular: Now will it follow, that because I
 must not love Money, that I may not love
 my Victuals, or that because I may not de-
 sire Riches, which *Agur* prayed against, I
 may not desire Food convenient for me,
 which he prayed for? 2^{dly}, When our Lord
 Math. 6. 24. saith, *No Man can serve two Masters*, can this
 be so interpreted, as to infer we cannot serve
 our Master Christ, and be Servants to our
Masters according to the Flesh in all things not
 forbidden by him? Must I needs hate my
 Master, if I love my Saviour; or despise him,
 if I cleave to my Lord Christ? Must not
 then the words be necessarily Interpreted of
 Masters Co-ordinate, or Masters whose Com-
 mands and Services do interfere? 3^{dly}, What
 is the Business of a Servant, is it not to obey
 the Pleasure of his Lord, and yield himself
 up entirely in Subjection to his Commands?
 What therefore must it be here to serve God,
 but to give up our selves entirely to his Ser-
 vice, and the Obedience of his Will? What
 to serve *Mammon*, but to give up our selves
 to the pursuit of Riches, and to obey the De-
 sires and Cravings of our covetous and world-
 ly Appetites? Thus it is certain, that we can-
 not divide betwixt God and the Creature,
 or love the one but from a Principle which
 excludes the love of the other; but a Subor-
 dinate Affection to the Creature is no more
 exclusive of our love to God, then is the Ser-
 vice

vice of an Earthly Master exclusive of the Service which we owe to Christ our Master.

Again, Christ places the due love of himself in the prevalence of our Affections to him above other things, saying, *He that loveth* Mat. 10.37.
Father and Mother, Son or Daughter, &c. is,
above me, is not worthy of me; whence it must follow by the Rule of contraries, that he who loveth Christ more than Father and Mother, Son or Daughter, or any worldly Interest whatever, must be worthy of him. From these two places it is therefore evident, that to love God so as to despise and to forsake all other things, to cleave unto him; to love God superlatively, so as to have our Affections more powerfully carried out after him, than any other thing that is most dear unto us, is, in the Scripture Sense, to love God with a whole and an entire Heart. And surely, if I love God, so as to love nothing which is contrary to him, or which he forbiddeth me to love, I can do nothing contrary to the love I owe unto him. If I love him, so as to prize neither Friendship, Relations, Fame, Honour, Pleasures, Riches, Life, or any temporal Concernments, so as to offend him by preserving them, I do not inordinately love them; for Obedience being the true test of Love; where there is no neglect of Obedience, there can be no want of love. Moreover, if I prize nothing in comparison with God in my mind, if I cleave to nothing in competition with him in my will, if I desire nothing in comparison with him in my Affections, if I pursue nothing but with re-
lation

lation to his Glory, and in Subordination to his Sacred Will, how can I be wanting in my Duty to him? And if I be not wanting in my Duty to him, how can I sin against him?

- §. 3. That by this Exposition this precept is extended beyond the real import of it, even beyond what any Person, in this State of Imperfection, doth, or can do, is very plausibly asserted by all the *Romish Commentators* I have read, and by the most judicious of the Reformed, who affirm, it only doth require sincere Obedience, and to aim at, and endeavour to advance to that Intension and Superlative Affection which we cannot expect compleatly to attain to in this Life.

But that any Person should not be satisfied with all this, but still be stretching of this Duty to a higher pitch, charging the Authors of this Exposition with *Insincerity*, and love unto their *Lusts*, and the Exposition it self with the most odious Consequences, this is just matter of our Admiration. And yet this is so plainly, and so confidently done by Mr. N. that in defence of their own Reputations, and of the Reputation of their traduced Brethren, all the whole Body of the *Clergy*, who differ from him in these Sentiments, stand bound to vindicate themselves from those vile Imputations which he casts upon them. For,

First, As to the first Part of the common Exposition, That *God must be loved with a Superlative Affection*, he Affirms that, "Sure the Authors of it could not but be sensible that
" herein

“ herein they did not rise up to the Letter of
 “ the Text, which manifestly requires a more
 “ elevated Sense; namely that our whole P. 12.
 “ Affections be placed upon God, and that
 “ we love him so entirely, as to love none
 “ but him. That we ought to love God, not
 “ only with the best and most, but with the
 “ whole of our Affection; that we love him P. 11.
 “ entirely, not only with Integrity of Parts,
 “ but with Integrity of Degrees; that we
 “ love him, not only with every Capacity,
 “ Passion and Faculty, with the Understand-
 “ ing suppose, Will and Affections, but in
 “ every degree of every Power, with all the
 “ latitude of our Will, and with the whole
 “ possibility of our Souls; that we bestow on
 “ him not only the highest degree of it, but
 “ every degree of it, the whole. In one
 “ word, that God be not only the Principal,
 “ but the Only Object of our Love. No less
 “ can he be supposed to require from us by
 “ Virtue of this Great Law, when he bids us
 “ to love him with all our Heart, with all our
 “ Soul, and with all our Mind.

Secondly, As to the second Branch of the
 ordinary Exposition, *That we are to love other
 things beside God, only in a way of relation, and
 “ subordination to God*; He is pleased to speak
 somewhat contemptibly of the Authors of it,
 as if he pitied their Ignorance. His words
 are these. “ So it is said by some who think P. 75.
 “ they strain the love of God to a very high
 “ pitch, when they tell us we must love no-
 “ thing but God, or in order and relation
 “ to God. So then, according to these Men,
 “ we are allow’d to love Creatures, provided
 “ it

" it be in a Relation and Subordination to
 " God, who, upon this Principle, is not to
 " be the only, but only the final and ultimate
 " Object of our Love. But methinks these
 " Mens relative Love is very much like the
 " relative Worship of the *Papists*, they make
 " God the only ultimate Object of Divine
 " Worship, and so do these Men make him
 " the only last Object of divine Love, but
 " yet they allow of giving divine Worship
 " to a Creature, provided it be in a transi-
 " tive and relative way. And so these Men
 " allow of bestowing our love upon a Crea-
 " ture, provided it be for God's sake, or in
 " relation to God, provided it do not stop at
 " the Creature, but run on till at last it fix
 " upon God as its final Object.

P. 217.

In his Tenth Letter he speaks thus ; " The
 " Truth and Reasonableness of this Notion,
 " (*viz.* That God only is to be the Object of
 " our Love,) seems to me so very evident,
 " that as I cannot withhold my assent from
 " it my self, so, were it not a matter of Pra-
 " ctice wherein our Passions and Interests are
 " concerned, as well as Theory that employs
 " our Understandings, I should strangely
 " wonder at all Rational and considerate
 " Persons that can. But this, in great mea-
 " sure, silences my admiration: For this is
 " the great disadvantage that all Truths of a
 " moral Nature lie under, in comparison of
 " those that are Physical or Mathematical,
 " that though the former be in themselves no
 " less certain than the latter, and demonstra-
 " ted with equal evidence, yet they will not
 " equally convince, nor find a parallel re-
 " ception

P. 218.

“ ception in the minds of Men, because they
 “ meet with their Passions and Lusts, and
 “ have often the Will and Affections to con-
 “ tend with, even after they have gained
 “ upon their Understandings.—— Were I
 “ to deal only with the Rational Part of
 “ Man, I should think the half of what has
 “ been said enough to convince that ; but
 “ considering the nature of the Truth I ad-
 “ vance, and what a strong Interest is made
 “ against it in the Affectionate Part of Human
 “ Nature, I cannot expect to find the Gene-
 “ rality of Men over forward to receive it.

“ ——The other Precepts of Morality cross P. 221.
 “ only some particular Interests of Man,
 “ and fight only against some of his strag-
 “ gling Passion ; but this engages the whole
 “ Body of Concupiscence, and at once en-
 “ counters the whole Interest of Prejudice,
 “ all the Force that is or can be raised in Hu-
 “ mane Nature; which when I consider I
 “ cannot hope by the clearest and strongest
 “ Reasoning to reconcile the Generality of
 “ the World to a Notion so opposite to the
 “ Passions, Customs, and Prejudices of it;
 “ only there may be here and there *some li-* P. 221. 2d.
 “ *beral and ingenious Spirits, who have in great*
 “ *measure purged themselves from the Prejudices*
 “ *of Sense, disengaged their Hearts from the love*
 “ *of sensible Objects, and so far entred into the*
 “ *methods of true Mortification, as to be capable*
 “ *of Conviction, and of having their minds*
 “ *wrought upon by the light and force of Reason.*
 And lastly he adds, “ That Men are back- P. 242, 243.
 “ ward not only to pay that entire Love
 “ which they owe to God, but even to ac-
 F “ know-

§. 6.

“ knowledge the Debt, and are not only
 “ loath to obey the Command, but even to
 “ understand it, will use a thousand Arts and
 “ Devices to shift off and evade the genuine
 “ force of it; and, rather than fail, will say,
 “ That though God in the most plain and
 “ express terms calls for whole Love, yet he
 “ means but a part of it. Strange and ama-
 “ zing Partiality and Presumption! But of
 “ this general Backwardness to receive the
 “ Sense of this plain Command (as plain as,
 “ *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me.*) I
 “ have already hinted an account in the for-
 “ mer part of this Letter. I shall not return
 that Answer to these reflecting Words which
 they deserve, but shall content my self,

First, To offer to Mr. N. some General
 Considerations which may be proper to move
 him, upon second thoughts, to abate him
 somewhat of his Confidence, and be more
 moderate in his Censures of his Fathers and
 Brethren, if not out of respect to them, yet
 out of regard to his own dear Self, who in
 his other Writings hath plainly and expressly
 taught that very Doctrine, and Exposition
 which he now Condemns.

Secondly, I shall further establish the com-
 mon Exposition, and confirm it by the clear-
 est Evidence of Scripture and of Reason.
 And,

Thirdly, Shall endeavour to return an An-
 swer to his pretended Demonstrations, for
 his new elevated Sense of this Command.
 And,

First,

First, Whereas he saith, *The common Interpreters sure could not but be sensible that herein they did not rise up to the Letter of the Text, which manifestly requires a more elevated Sense.* Let me instruct him to consider whether Christian Charity will permit him thus peremptorily to pronounce that before him; and Mr. Malbranch, and all Commentators gave such a Sense of this great Commandment, of which they could not but be sensible that it fell short of all Mens Duty, or of what God required them to do, *that they might live;* and that they thus deviated from the Sense which the Text manifestly required; that is, that the Interpretation they delivered, as the true import of the Text, was contrary to the manifest Sense of it, and to the inward Sentiments of their own Consciences.

Secondly, Whereas he adds, *That they could* P. 7.
not advance higher without building in the Air, and were therefore forced to cramp the Sense of this great Commandment, and to put such a Construction upon it not as the express words of it require, but as their Hypothesis would bear. And that only he and Mr. Malbranch, have thought P. 22.
otherwise, or any further. Let me entreat him to consider whether it be reasonable to conceive that God left all Men ignorant of the true Grounds of this Command, till he and Mr. M. appeared to instruct the World in the true meaning of it; that though all Men were obliged by the light of Nature, all Jews and Christians by the light of Scripture, to love God with all their Hearts and Souls, yet they had no just Ground or Reason so to do, till

A Discourse of

Deut. 6. 4.
Mark 12.
29, 30.

he and Mr. M. bleſ'd the World with this new Invention, that our Lord hath given us another reason of this Precept is evident from these words, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God, & ἀγαπᾷς, therefore thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c.* And I hope he will not dare to say that he *built Castles in the Air*, for want of his Philosophy, or gave us only such a reason as forced us to cramp the Sense of this Commandment.

P. 11, 15.

P. 37.

Thirdly, Let me entreat him to consider the plain Consequences of this his singular Opinion and Interpretation of these words, *viz.* That all *Interpreters* before him have taught all Men to love God less than he required of them by virtue of this great Law, to do God great Injury and Injustice, to defraud the Creator of what was due to him, to cross the Order of Nature, and resist the Will of its Great Author; to be Idolaters, i. e. to worship the Sun, and to give every Creature a share in our Religious Acknowledgments; to commit *Spiritual Fornication and Adultery*; to *Deifie* and *Idolize* the Creature; to do what is as much *Idolatry*, as is that *Relative Worship* which the *Papists* do ascribe to Images. Now can he indeed believe all Christians and Jews of former Ages were, and that all at present, besides Mr. *Malbranch*, and those few who embrace his Sentiments, are Guilty of these horrid Crimes? If not, he must be so Uncharitable, as to think they do not act according to their Principles, or must confess that these things do not follow from them.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, When he saith his Exposition is so very evident, that it is matter of just Admiration, that any Rational and Considerate Person can withhold his assent from it; and that the reason why we do not see, or seeing will not own it, is because it thwarts our Passions, Interests and Lusts, Customs and Prejudices: Because we have not purged our selves from the Prejudices of Sense, disingaged our Hearts from the love of sensible Objects, nor entred so far into the Methods of true Mortification, as to be capable of Conviction: That they who allow not of it, are Guilty of strange and amazing Partiality and Presumption, unwilling not only to obey the Command, but to understand it, and rather willing to shew a thousand Arts and Devices to shift off, and evade the genuine force of it. I say, when he useth such Expressions, let me entreat him to consider whether it doth become him thus to bespatter all his Adversaries, and tell them to their faces, if they will not yield assent to his odd Notion, they must have Lusts and Passions, which obstruct the Evidence of Truth; to cause all his Fathers and Brethren who comply not with his Sentiments, which scarce any of them do, as Guilty of strange and amazing Partiality, as Men not purged from the Prejudices of Sense, not disingaged from the love of sensible Objects, not entred so far into the Methods of true Mortification, as to be capable of Conviction.

Fifthly, Because it may be some Inducement to him, to shew more moderation in his Censures of those that differ from him in this

Matter, to consider that the Great Mr. Norris was formerly of the same Opinion with them, and that they differ no more from him, than he now differs from his former self, I shall proceed to shew that in his former Treatises he hath conspired with us in this matter. For,

P. 426. 1st. In his *Idea of Happiness*, discoursing of the Degrees of the love of God, he saith, "The Computation of Bellarmine is accurate enough, who reckons Four. The first, is to love God proportionably to his loveliness, i. e. with an infinite Love, and this Degree is peculiar to God himself; The second, is to love him not proportionably to his Loveliness, but to the utmost Capacity of a Creature, and this Degree is peculiar to Saints and Angels in Heaven. The third, is to love him not to the utmost Capacity of a Creature absolutely considered, but to the utmost Capacity of a mortal Creature in this Life; and this, he says, is proper to the Religious. The fourth, is to love him not proportionably to the utmost Capacity of a Creature, but only so as to love nothing equally with, or above him, that is not to do any thing contrary to the Divine Love; and this, saith Mr. N. is an absolute indispensable Duty, less than which will not qualify us for the Enjoyment of God hereafter."

P. 83, 84.

In his Treatise of the Theory and Regulation of Love, he saith, That "as we are obliged to love God, so ought we to love him beyond all other things whatsoever. — We may, and must Prefer him in our Love, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, with all thy Soul, with all thy Mind,

“ Mind, and with all thy Strength. So runs
 “ the Commandment, and very just we should;
 “ for if, even in particular Goods, Order requires
 “ that the most lovely should be loved most:
 “ N. B. much more ought we to love him who
 “ is the very Essence of Good, Good it self, be-
 “ yond all Derivative and secondary Good.

In his Treatise of Heroick Piety, he hath
 these words; “ I know it is usually Objected, P. 181.
 “ That what is supposed to be thus Heroickly per-
 “ formed, is inclusively enjoined by virtue of those
 “ comprehensive Words, Thou shalt love the
 “ Lord with all thy Heart. To which Ob-
 jection he Answers thus: “ I conceive that ~~all~~
 “ which is intended by that Phrase amounts to no
 “ more than, (1st.) a sincere love of God, as
 “ ’tis opposed to that which is partial and divi-
 “ ded; and, (2dly,) such a degree of loving as
 “ admits of nothing in competition with him:
 “ And thus far reaches the bounds of indispen-
 “ sable Duty, it being impossible that he who does
 “ not love God in this Sense and Degree, should
 “ keep his Commandments.

Now here I would crave leave to ask him
 whether, when he wrote these things, He
 could not but be sensible that he did not rise up to
 the Letter of the Text, and that it manifestly re-
 quired a more elevated Sense; though, to pre-
 serve his Heroick Piety, he pretended to con-
 ceive, it amounted to no more than loving God
 sincerely in opposition to a partial and divided love,
 and so as to admit of nothing into competition
 with him? Whether by these Sayings he
 taught Men to love God less than he required, to
 defraud him of his due, to resist his Will? &c.
 Whether he only said these things, as being

A Discourse of

then under the Power of his Passions, Lusts, Interests, Customs and Prejudices, and not being in due measure purged from the Prejudices of Sense, not disengaged from the love of sensible Objects, not so far entered into the methods of true Mortification, as to be capable of Conviction; and of having his mind wrought upon by the light and force of Reason? If not, let him learn hereafter, from his own Sense and Experience, not to pass such severe and undue Censures on his Brethren. Having premised these things, I proceed,

2dly, To establish and confirm the common Exposition from the Evidence of Scripture, and of Reason. Let it be then observed,

- §. 6. First, That this Command was given to the Jewish Nation, and is only cited by our Lord, or by the Lawyer, from Deut. 6. 5. where the words runs thus, *Hear; O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.* Now hence ariseth a demonstration, that this Text cannot be expounded so as to exclude all love, or all desire of the Creature. For the Land they lived in was the Land of Promise, stiled by God himself, אֶרֶץ חָמֵד, *The pleasant Land*, or, *The Land of Desire*, Psal. 106. 24. Dan. 8. 9. אֶרֶץ צָבִי, *The Land of Glory*, or the Glorious Land, as being the Glory, the most pleasant, and desirable of all Lands; to encourage them to go in and possess it, it is represented to them as an exceeding good Land, a Land which floweth with Milk and Honey; a good Land, a Land of Wheat, and Barley, and Vines, Land;
- Ezek. 20. 6.
Dan. 11. 16
Num. 8. 7, 8.
Deut. 8. 7, 8, 9.

and Figtrees, and Pomegranates; a Land of Oil. Olive and Honey; a Land wherein they should eat Bread without scarceness, and in which they should not lack any thing; a Land which the Lord thy God careth for; the eyes of the Lord thy God are upon it, from the beginning of the year, even to the end of the year. And might they not desire what was the very promise made to the Seed of Abraham? Might they not love, or be pleased with a Land so glorious, so pleasant, and desirable? Doubtless they would have marched but heavily through the Barren and Desolate Wilderness, had Moses by this Precept forbid them to desire, or be pleased with this Land flowing with Milk and Honey. Moreover, the Blessings of this Life were the chief things which God did promise to these Jews, as the Reward of their Affection and Obedience to him; whence he is said to give them Wealth, that he might stablish his Covenant with them, to make them plenteous in the Works of their hands for Good: And the taking away of those outward Blessings was the chief thing threatned in the Law of Moses, to deter them their Disobedience; For, saith God, if you will hearken diligently to my Commandments, to love the Lord your God, and to serve him with all your heart, and with all your soul, then will I give you the Rain of thy Land in due season, that thou mayst gather thy Corn, and thy Wine, and thy Oil: And I will send Grass in thy Field for thy Cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full. Ye shall serve the Lord thy God, and he shall bless thy Bread, and thy Water; and I will take Sickness from thee, and fulfil the number of thy days. Ye shall do my Statutes,

Deut. 11. 12.

Deut. 8. 18.

Deut. 11. 13, 14, 15.

Exod. 23. 25, 26.

Levit. 15. 18, 19.

Levit. 26.
3, 4, 5, 6.

Deut. 28.
1—13.

Deut. 30. 9.

Deut. 6. 10,
11.
ch. 26. 11.

tutes, and shall keep my Judgments; and ye shall dwell in the Land in safety, and the Land shall yield her Fruit, and ye shall eat your fill. If ye walk in my Statutes, and keep my Commandments to do them, then will I give you Rain in due season, and the Land shall yield her increase, and the Trees of the Field shall yield their Fruit, and you shall eat your Bread to the full, and dwell in your Land safely. And I will give you peace in the Land, and you shall lie down, and none shall make you afraid; and I will have respect unto you, and make you fruitful, and multiply you. If thou observe to do all the Commands which I command thee this day, blessed shalt thou in the City, blessed in the Field, blessed in the Fruit of thy Body, of thy Ground, of thy Cattle, in the increase of thy Kine, and the Flocks of thy Sheep, in thy Basket, and thy Store: The Lord shall command the Blessing upon thee in thy Store-Houses, and all that thou settest thy hand unto: The Lord shall make thee plenteous in Goods, in the Fruit of thy Body, of thy Cattle, and thy Ground: The Lord shall open to thee his good Treasure, the Heaven to give thee Rain unto thy Land in its season, and to bless all the work of thine hand. If thou obey the voice of the Lord, he will make thee plenteous in every work of thine Hand, in the Fruit of thy Body, of thy Cattle, and of thy Land for Good; for the Lord will again rejoice over thee for Good, as he rejoiced over thy Fathers. These temporal good things he declares to be his Gifts; for these he requires them to bless the Donor, saying, *When thou hast eaten, and art full, then shalt thou bless the Lord thy God, for the good Land he hath given thee; commanding them to rejoice*
in

in every good thing he hath given them. Moreover, upon their Disobedience, he threatneth the removal of all these Blessings, and to strip them of all these good things; that he would shut up the Heavens, that there be no Rain, that the Land yield not her Fruit, and that they should perish quickly from the good Land that God had given them; that they should be cursed in their Basket and Store, in the Fruit of their Body, of their Land, of their Kine, and Sheep; that he would send upon them Cursing, Vexation, and Rebuke in all they put their hand unto; and that they should serve their Enemies in Hunger, and in Thirst, and in Nakedness, and in want of all things. Now if God, by requiring them to love the Lord with all their Hearts and Souls, had enjoined them not to desire, or affect any of these outward things, to what purpose doth he promise what he forbids them to desire? Or what Encouragement can such Promises afford them thus to love him? If these things were in no sense their good, why are they stiled God's Blessings and his Gifts? And why are they commanded to rejoice in them, and so bless him for them? Yea, why are they said to be blessed in them? But if they were their good things, why might they not desire or effect them proportionably to the Goodness that was in them? Yea lastly, if they were not good and desirable things, wherein consists the hurt and Curse in being stripped and deprived of them? 'Tis therefore manifest that this Interpretation, as it casts a slur and a reproach on all God's temporal Blessings, as having in them nothing good, nothing fit to be desired, or worthy

Deut. 11.

16, 17.

Deut. 28.

17, 18, 20,

48.

worthy to be loved, and therefore tends to rob him of the Praises due unto him for them, so doth it also impair the force of all the Promises by which God did endeavour to engage his People thus to love him, and of those threats by which he did deter them from their Disobedience; this therefore cannot be the genuine import of these words.

Argum. 2. Again, from this Consideration, That this
 §. 7. Command was given to the *Jewish Nation*, it follows that it ought to bear the Sense which is the certain import of it in all those other places of the *Old Testament* where it only doth occur, it being only found in the *New Testament* as a Citation thence. 'Tis therefore certain, that it doth not require us to love God in perfection of degrees, or in the elevated Sense contended for, but only to love him with a sincere and a prevailing love. For,

First, God's Servants entred into a Covenant to serve the Lord after this manner.
 2 Chron. 15. 12. Thus *Asa* gathered all *Benjamin* and *Judah*, and they entred into Covenant to seek the Lord God with all their Heart, and with all their Soul.
 2 Kings 23. 3. And good *Josiah*, with all his People, made a Covenant before the Lord to walk after the Lord, and to keep his Commandments with all their Heart, and with all their Soul: Now if, in this Covenant, they promised to love God with every degree of every Power, with the whole possibility of the Soul; to bestow on him not only the highest Degree of it, but every Degree of it, the whole; and to make him not only the Principal, but the only Object of their love, they promised
 what

the Love of God.

77

what they knew they never could, what to be sure they never did perform. And why then is it said, *That the People stood to the Covenant, and that God was found of them.* But if they only promised love of Sincerity, and love to God above all other things, and that they would adhere to him and his Service, then may this Phrase Import no more.

Secondly, This God required them to do, to render them the Objects of his Grace and Favour, promising to have Mercy on them in their Captivity on this Condition. *If from thence, saith Moses, thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him; if thou seek him with all thy Heart, and all thy Soul.* And again, *if thou shalt return to the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, and with all thy Soul, then the Lord thy God will turn thy Captivity, and have Compassion on thee, and will bring thee into the Land which thy Fathers possessed; and thou shalt possess it, and he will do thee Good.* And upon this Condition only doth Solomon desire this Mercy, saying, *If they turn to thee with all their Heart and all their Soul in the Land of their Enemies, then hear thou their Prayer and their Supplication.* Now is it reasonable to conceive that God required such an absolute Perfection of Degrees in their Affection and Obedience, to qualifie them for his Favour under their Captivity? If so, they must for ever have continued Captives. Would he promise to restore them to their good Land, and to do them Good upon a Condition that would not permit them either to desire that pleasant Land, or any other Temporal Enjoyment as their Good? Sure the Suspension of his

his Favour upon this Condition, is a clear Evidence, that this Phrase bears a milder Sense.

Thirdly, God doth acknowledge that some of them did actually love him thus, That

1 Kings 14. 8. King David had kept his Commandments, and followed him with all his heart, saving in the matter of Uriah; and yet we find him Guilty of Mistrust of God's own Promise, by saying, *I shall one day perish by the hand of Saul*; of Lying to Abimelech, of a rash Oath, in Swearing to cut off the House of Nabal; of Injustice, in giving a deceitful Ziba half the Goods of Mephibosheth; and of Pride, in numbering the People. God also testifies of good Josiah, That he turned to the Lord with all his Soul, and all his Heart, and all his Might, since therefore God himself declares of Men thus subject to Imperfection that they did thus love him, that love cannot require a Perfection of Degrees, but only a sincere and prevalent Affection to him.

§. 8.

In a word, in the Language of the Old Testament, to serve God with the whole heart and Soul; to walk before him with a perfect heart, and with Integrity of heart, hath an essential respect to the owning him alone to be the true God, in opposition to all strange Gods, and the continuing steadfast in his Service, in opposition to the Service of the Heathen Idols, or the Calves of Dan and Bethel; Thus when God permitted a False Prophet to arise among them, and to shew a Sign, or do a Wonder to tempt them to desert him, and go after other Gods, he declares he did this for
tryal,

tryal, Whether they loved the Lord their God Deut. 13. 3.
 with all their Hearts, and all their Souls, and
 therefore it must be sufficient to shew they
 did so, that they were not prevailed upon by
 that false Prophet to decline from following
 after God, but still cleaved stedfastly to him.
 Hence of those Kings who, with the true
 God, served Idols, or served him in an undue
 manner; it is said, they did not serve God
 with all their hearts. V. G. Jehu took no heed 2 Kings 10.
 to walk in the Law of the Lord his God with all
 his heart, for he departed not from the sins of Je-
 roboam. And of Solomon it is said, That his 1 Kings 11.
 Wives turned away his heart after other Gods, 4.
 and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his
 God. Of Abijam, That his heart was not per- ch. 15. 3.
 fect with the Lord as the heart of David his
 Father, for he walked in all the sins of his Father 2 Chron.
 Rehoboam, who forsook the Law of the Lord. 12. 1.
 And of Amaziah, That he did that which was ch. 25. 2.
 right in the sight of the Lord, but not with a per-
 fect heart; because coming from the Slaughter
 of the Edomites, he brought the gods of the Chil- ver. 14.
 dren of Seir, and set them up to be his gods; and
 bowed down himself before them, and burnt in-
 cense to them. Whereas the contrary is said
 of all those Kings who put away all Idolatry,
 and served him according to the Law of Mo-
 ses, viz. of Hezekiah, who removed the high 2 Kings 18.
 Places, and brake the Images, and cut down the 24.
 Groves, it is said, That he walked before the ch. 20. 3.
 Lord in truth, and with a perfect heart. Of
 Asa, who removed all the Idols which his Father 1 Kings 15.
 had made; That his heart was perfect with the 12, 14.
 Lord all his days. And of Josiah, who put a-
 way all the Images, and the Idols, and the Abo-
 minations

minations which were in the land of Judah, and in Jerusalem; That he turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses. Thus of Judah revolting from the Lord, after the Punishment of Israel for her Idolatry, it is said, she turned not unto the Lord, &c. ὁλως ἔκκλις, from her whole heart, but feignedly. And the advice of Samuel to Israel runs thus, Serve the Lord with all your heart, and turn you not aside after vain things. From which Observation we may reasonably Collect, that when we love God, so as not to make an Idol of any thing by loving it in opposition to his will, or equally with God, or so as that it Rivals not him, nor draws our Hearts from that Obedience we owe to him; then do we in the prime import of this Phrase, love God with all our Souls and Hearts; and hence we learn how apposite the reason here assigned is, for loving God with all our Hearts and Souls, viz. That the Lord is one God, or that he only is the Lord, and therefore to him alone belongeth the superlative Affection of the Soul and Heart, which is due from all Creatures to their God.

Argument 3. Thirdly, The love required by this Text, our Lord requires as the Condition of Salvation; for the Question of the Scribe was this, By doing what shall I inherit Life Eternal? the Answer of our Lord is this, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c. this do, and thou shalt live, i. e. eternally. What therefore he requires in this Text he plainly doth require as the Condition of Salvation. Now that

that cannot be love of God with that Perfection of degrees which excludes all Imperfection, and so all Sin, for were that made the necessary Condition of Salvation, no Person could be saved, the best of Men being Imperfect, and subject to sin in this Life. Moreover this new Exposition destroys the Covenant of Grace, for that requires only *sincere Obedience* as the Condition of Salvation, and introduceth again the Covenant of Works, *i. e.* a Covenant requiring perfect Obedience in order unto Life.

Fourthly, If to love God with all the heart, *Argument 4.*
import the loving him *with all our love, so as* §. 10.
to have no other Object of our love, or on which
we may in any measure set out heart, then
to love God, ἐν ᾧ τῇ διανοίᾳ, and ἐν ᾧ τῇ
συνέσει, with all our Mind, and all our Under- Mark 12.
standing, must import that we must have no 32.
other object of our Mind, no Knowledge,
no Understanding of any thing else, nothing
but God on which we may imploy our ra-
tional Faculties, the reason being perfectly
the same in both cases, because the Com-
mand is so, but this is manifestly absurd, as
being not only contrary to the Practice of all
Mankind, but destructive of all Sciences, all
Arts and Trades, unless they are best learnt,
and acquired by thinking upon God alone.

Moreover this Exposition, as it gives the truest import of these words, so hath it also this to recommend it, that it serves all the designs of Religion in the General, and of Christian Religion in Particular, as much as doth

A Discourse of

the Exposition of these words for which good Mr. N. and the Lady do so much contend. For,

Let. 5. p. 94.

10. p. 238.

First, Do Mr. N. and the Lady recommend unto us their Sense of this command as an *effectual preservative against Sin*? Sure this is done as fully by that love which doth engage us to be *always ready to lose any temporal Good, or suffer any temporal Evil, rather than commit the least Sin against God.* Moreover can his Understanding be prevailed upon to prize any thing, or be concerned for any thing so much as to endeavour to obtain, or to preserve it by displeasing God, who *values the favour of God infinitely above all other things, and counts them loss and dung compared to him!* Can his Will be diverted from God by any temporal Concerns, or any Charms of a Temptation, who *loves him so as still to cleave unto him, in opposition to all other things, and to admit of nothing which stands in competition with him for his love; yea, who has nothing he doth not truly hate and despise, comparatively to his Favour; nothing that can tempt him to depart from him, or do the thing that will provoke his Displeasure?* can he offend in his Affections to, or his desire of any worldly Good, *whose love to God, and his desire to enjoy him, will not permit him to desire any thing in opposition to him, or against his Will and Pleasure?* If then the Love we plead for will not permit the Lover to offend in Mind, in Will, Affection, or Desire, how can it suffer him to offend in Action? *How pure and chaste then must his Soul be, that is so thoroughly purged of all created Loves, and in whom the love*
of

Let. 10. p.
238.

of God reigns so absolute, and unrival'd, as it does in such a Lover's Breast, who* never suffers any thing to stand in Competition with his Love and Duty to his God? But when it once begins to do so, hates and rejects it with the utmost detestation. *How secure must he* P. 239.
needs be from Sin, when he has not that in him which may betray him to it. He has but one Love at all predominant in his heart, and that is for God, none but what is entirely subject to, and governed by it; and how can he that thus loves nothing but God, be tempted to Transgress against him.

Secondly, Do they represent the Sense which they impose upon this Precept as that which elevates the amorous Soul to the most noble Heights of Piety, as an effectual means to secure Obedience, and a strong Impellent to Good? Will not that Love which will not suffer me to Sin against God preserve me holy, pure, and harmless before him in love? Will not that Affection do the same which obliges me, (1.) to prize him above all things, to esteem him infinitely more valuable in himself, and infinitely more beneficial to me than all things else I can enjoy; to look upon him as my chief Good, the only Felicity of my Immortal Soul, the only Being in whom its Everlasting Happiness, and its true Satisfaction doth consist. Oh! What can be too P. 100.
difficult to do, to acquire a more perfect Enjoyment of what we thus love and prize? What can be too hard to suffer for the sake of the chief Object which hath thus won our heart? (2.) Will not that Affection which so powerfully doth convince me, That there is infinitely more Excellency in God, more Happiness to be expected from him

him, than all the Honours, Pleasures, Profits, Interests, Relations, and Satisfactions of the World can send, engage me always to prefer his Service before these base and trivial Interests? And (3.) will not that Love which carries my Heart more ardently, my Desires more fervently after God than any other thing, make me long, breath, pant, thirst more after him, rejoice more in his Favour, and be more satisfied with it than in Manrow and Easness; make me diligent and vigorous, always abounding in the work of the Lord. "Whilst this Devout Lover thus
 "Contemplates the Divine Perfections, whilst
 "he looks on God as his exceeding great Reward, and desires him accordingly, is not
 "his Obedience prompt and ready? Does
 "not his mind move with alacrity, and unwearied vigour? And are not all its Motions regular and pleasing? Must not he who so zealously desires, and so impatiently thirsteth after God, be very well disposed, and above all things industrious to unite himself unto God, must not he who thus prizes him for his incomparable Excellencies, think it his Happiness and Perfection, and therefore make it above all things his endeavour to be like him? Must not that secure our Obedience to him, which constrains us always to prefer our Interest in his Perfections, and in the Blessings he hath promised to the Obedient, before all other things: To obey him, rather than Man; to please him, rather than to gratifie our selves; to enjoy him, rather than any worldly or carnal Interest whatever: And forces us to say with the Psalmist, Whom have I in Heaven like thee, or what

P. 192.

P. 185.

is there on Earth I can desire in comparison of thee? What incentive can he want to engage him to walk before God unto all well-pleasing, P. 240. and to perfect Holiness in the fear of God, and what a wonderful Progress must he needs make in it? Whether will not this superlative Love of God carry him; and to what degrees of Perfection will he not aspire, under the Conduct of so Divine, so Omnipotent a Principle? If Obedience be the Fruit of Love, then what an entire Obedience may we expect from so intire a Love as can admit of nothing into competition with it, nothing which is not wholly subject to, and governed by it; And so can have no Suckers to draw off the Nourishment from it, no other Love to check and hinder its Growth; what is there that can hinder him who has so emptied P. 241. his heart of the Creatures, and devoted it so entirely to God, that his desire of all other things is always comparatively none, and, when they hinder his desire of him, are absolutely none, from reaching the highest pitch of assumable P. 188, 189. Goodness? Since therefore where-ever Obedience is found, 'tis a certain Criterion of Love; and to derive universal Obedience from the Love of God, or to argue from that Obedience to the entire, N. B. Love of God, is as sound a way of Argumentation, as to prove any other Effect by its Cause, or Cause by its Effect. Hence from the universal Obedience which this Love must produce, I argue demonstratively, That it is that entire Love of God which is required by the Command, To love God with all our hearts. Seeing there is no better Diagnostick to discover P. 189, 190. our Love, then by observing what is the most frequent Subject of our Thoughts; and where-ever

A Discourse of

the weight of our Desire rests, the stream of our Thoughts will follow ; it being certain, that what I prize above all things, and above all things desire, must be still uppermost in my Thoughts, and be the very thing on which the weight of my desire rests: What better Diagnostick can I have to prove my Genuine Affection to that God I do so infinitely prize, so fervently desire, and in Affection do prefer before all other Objects ? If therefore we would come up to our Holy Religion, if we would be those Wise and Excellent Creatures that God designs we should, let us above all things fix our love upon its proper Object, put it into a regular Motion, and then do but allow it scope, and faithfully pursue its Tendencies, and we need not be afraid of doing amiss ; we should run the Race that is set before us with Cheerfulness and Vigour, in a direct Line, and with unwearied Constancy. For what wise Man would think much to relinquish a lesser, for a greater Good ? Or shew any Inclination for lower Delights, when courted to the Enjoyment of the Highest ?

P. 194.

P. 195.

P. 96.

P. 97.

Thirdly, Do they say the Love of God they plead for makes the best provision for our Pleasure ? Is not this as true of the measures of Divine Love assigned by us ? For have not we who Contemplate and Prize him as our Chiefest Good, and our exceeding great Reward, compared to whom nothing is lovely or desirable, the same Object still present with us ? And the same reason to fix the Eyes of our Understanding on, and direct the Motions of our Will towards him ? May we not always Contemplate and Enjoy his Beauty, assuage our Thirst at this

Foun.

Fountain, and feast our hungry Souls upon his never-failing Charms? And must not the Assurance of our Interest in so great a Good, our Enjoyment of a Reward so Excellent, our sight of such a Perfect and a Charming Beauty, the Satisfaction which all our Appetites may find in sweet Communion with, and in Enjoyment of him who is so able to replenish all our Faculties, and gratifie all our Desires, even Ravish our Hearts, and fill our Souls with unspeakable Delight? Must not these Sentiments be highly Ravishing and Entertaining, must they not fill every Faculty with a full Tide of Joy? Must they not be Sweetnesses that know no Bitter, Joys without Alloy, Pleasures that have no Sting? P. 256, 257.

Fourthly, Do they add that by this Love we are secured from Disappointment, Jealousies, and all that long train of Pain and Grief which attends Desire when it moves towards the Creature. While others are tormented with Fears and Cares, unsatisfied Desires, and unprosperous Attempts, &c. Are they not as entirely secured from any thing of this nature who love nothing, and desire nothing but in relation to God, i. e. as it enables us to serve him, is instrumental to his Glory, or to our Enjoyment of him, or to perform the Duty we owe to others for his sake? And, 2dly, in Subordination to God, so as that our Love to, or our desire of them, is wholly subject to, and governed by our Affection to him. And, 3dly, with entire Resignation to his all-Wise Providence, and full Submission to his Will; so that we desire nothing but conditionally, if Divine Wisdom see it good for us, we ask nothing but

G 4

with

A Discourse of

with this Restriction, *if it be thy pleasure*; and are still ready to part with it, when he who gave it is pleased to recal it, and to say when he hath done so, *The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the Name of the Lord.* For what more naturally tends to produce in us that *γαλήνη*, that Quietness, that Smoothness, and Tranquillity of Spirit in all Conditions and Events, in which *Philosophers* have plac'd the Happiness of Man? Is it not evident that he whose Will is thus resigned to the Will of God, cannot be cross'd in his Desires? and so he never can admit of a Disturbance, or a Disappointment, or be in Pain, or an excess of Grief, but whatsoever doth befall him, can *possess his Soul in Patience*; he fears not any thing which may betide him, because he knows it must befall him by the Direction of that Providence which he is willing should dispose of all his Interests and Concerns, nor is he troubled with distracting Cares for any thing he wants, because he is contented to want what Providence sees fitting to deny him.

P. 233.

“ How happy therefore is the Man who
 “ can thus Order and Regulate the Master
 “ and leading Passion of his Nature. That
 “ can thus *love the Lord his God with all his*
 “ *Heart, Soul and Mind*; how to be envied is
 “ that Man who can thus disengage his Affe-
 “ ctions from the Creature, and settle his
 “ whole Love upon God? [That he loves
 “ nothing else but for his sake, nothing but as
 “ ’tis instrumental to his Glory, nothing but
 “ with entire submission to his all-wise Pleasure.]
 “ That can force the Creatures to withdraw,
 “ command their absence, and wholly empty
 “ his

“ his heart of their love. [Yea can hate and despise them whenever they prove Temptations to, or Hinderances of his Love to, or his Enjoyment of God.] “ How ravishing and lasting are his Delights? How solid and profound is his Peace? How full and overflowing are his Joys? How bright and lucid are the Regions of his Soul? How entire and undisturbed are his Enjoyments? “ What a settled Calm possesses his Breast? “ What a firm stable Rest does his Soul find when she thus reposes her full weight upon God? How loose and disentangled is he from the World; and how unconcerned doth he pass along through the various Scenes and Revolutions of it; how unmoved and unaltered in all the several Changes and Chances of this present Life?

Why therefore doth Mr. N. tell us, That the Man that harbours Creatures in his Bosom, *Lett. 10. p. 240, 241.* and divides his Heart betwixt God and them, will be always in great danger of being betrayed by them; and though he should with great Care, and habitual Watchfulness preserve for God a greater share in his Affections (which is the most such a one can pretend to) yet he will have such a weight constantly hanging upon his Soul, that he will be never able to soar very high, or arrive at any Excellency in Religion? Can our Love of what God promises; our Esteem for his Blessings; our Desire of what he commands us to pray for that we may, and to give thanks for when we have received, be obstructive to our advancement in Religion? Can that Heart be said to be divided betwixt God and the Creatures, which never suffers the Creature to come

A Discourse of

come in competition with him, never loves it in opposition to him? Can that Soul have any weight upon it obstructing its ascent to God, which always infinitely prefers him in her Affections before all other things; and is still ready to quit them for his sake?

In fine, it may deserve to be considered, that we cannot safely argue that a thing is, may, or should be so, because it would be an advantage to Religion were it so: For what an advantage would it be to Truth, to have a *living Infallible Judge* of it; or that every *Parson* of a *Parish*, or every *Private Person* were *Infallible*? But must we therefore grant to the *Papist* such a *living Judge*, or to the *Quaker* such an *Infallible Spirit*? What fine Harangues might Mr. N. and the Good Lady make of the Advantages to Religion, which might arise from living without sleep, or weariness, or without the *Body which presseth down the Soul*, and yet all their fine *Rhetorick* would be lost, because this sutes not with that Nature God hath given us; if then he hath given us a Nature subject to the same Necessities of other things, as well as Sleep and Faculties, which cannot but desire them; so that we may expect as well to live without the Body, as without them: They must also spend their *Rhetorick* in vain, when they endeavour to perswade us to *banish all desire of the Creature from us*.

CHAP. IV.

The Contents.

This Chapter contains an Answer to Mr. N.'s Arguments from Scripture, for a love of God exclusive of all love of Desire of the Creature; as, V. G. 1st. From these Words, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c. Matth. 22. 37. §. 1. 2dly. From those Words of St. James, Ye Adulterers and Adulteresses, know ye not that the Friendship of this World is enmity to God, James 4. 4. §. 2. 3dly. From these Words of St. John, Love not the World, neither the things that are in the World, 1 John 2. 15. §. 3. And to his Arguments against the relative Love of the Creature, V. G. 1. That it is as much Idolatry, as the relative Worship of the Creature. This Answered, 1. ad hominem, by shewing that it was formerly approved by Mr. N. 2. By shewing the Disparities betwixt the relative Love of the Creature, and the relative Worship of Images, §. 4. Object. 2. If Creatures be truly and properly lovely, as being our true and proper Good, they are to be loved absolutely and for themselves; if not, they are not to be loved

A Discourse of

loved at all. Answered, by shewing in what Sense they may be stiled our true and proper Good, and be loved for themselves, viz. as that imports a love of them only for that Goodness God hath put into them; and how they may not be loved absolutely, and for themselves, viz. as that excludes the Subordination of that Affection to the Love of God, §. 5.

§. I.

Serm. p. 10.

Against this sense of the Words I plead for, Mr. N. hath but one Objection from the words themselves, and it runs thus, "The Text saith, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy Soul, and with all thy Mind*, but does he love God at this Rate, who loves him only principally, and more than any thing else? Does this exhaust the Sense of this great Commandment? Can he be said, with any tolerable Sense, to love God with all his Heart and Soul, that only loves him above other things, at the same time allowing other things a share in his love? Can he be said to love God with all his Love, N. B. who loves him only with a part? What though that part be the larger part, 'tis but a part still, and is a part of the whole? What Logick, or what Grammar will endure this? To this I answer,

Answ. 1.

First, That he assumes what never will be granted by Divines, viz. That Scripture Phrases must be Interpreted not according to the Analogy of Faith, and the import of the same

same words elsewhere occurring in the Holy Scripture, but according to the Rules of Logick and of Grammar, which supposition would render the Interpretation of Scripture very absurd in many places. For instance,

1. The Apostle saith, *All Men seek their own*, and not the things of Jesus Christ; that is, say Interpreters, many, or most Men, do so. The Gospel was Preached to all the World, to every Creature under Heaven, saith the same Apostle; and the Faith of the Romans was spoken of in all the World; when as then many Parts even of the Roman Empire had heard nothing of it. Here therefore all Interpreters allow a *Synecdoche totius pro parte*, i. e. the whole is put for the most celebrated Parts of the World; and will he here ask, Can that be said to be Preached to all, and spoken of in all the World, which is only Preached and spoken of in a part of it? Is a part the whole?

2. Again, *Children obey your Parents in all things; Servants obey your Masters according to the Flesh in all things*, saith the Text. This Generality, say Interpreters, is to be restrain'd to all things honest, to all things belonging to their Rights as Parents, or Masters to command; and will he here cry out, What Logick, or what Grammar will endure this?

3. In Precepts absolutely negative, and even exclusive, that which in Words is absolutely denied, must be interpreted so as only to import, that 'tis denied not absolutely, but comparatively, not as to the whole, but as to the degree; as, *V. G. God saith, I required Mercy, and not Sacrifice*; when as yet the greatest part of *Leviticus* is im-

Phil. 2. 21.

Col. 1. 6, 23.

Rom. 1. 8.

Col. 3. 20,

22.

Negatio non est absoluta sed per comparationem.

Hos. 6. 6.

Mat. 9. 13.

Mat. 10. 20.

ploy'd

- ploy'd in giving Laws concerning Sacrifices. Christ saith, *Fear not them which can kill the Body*; Samuel, *Only fear the Lord, and serve him*; and yet saith the Scripture, *Fear the Lord, and the King, and Render to all their dues, fear to whom fear*; so that the import of these Words must be this, Fear not the one so much as the other; fear not Man or Idols so as to incur the displeasure of God. Labour not for the Meat that perisheth, saith the Scripture, *Μὴ ἐργάζεσθε, Work not for it*; and yet saith the same Scripture, *Let him that stole, steal no more, but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing that is good, for he that will not labour shall not eat*; so that the import of that Phrase is only this, Do not chiefly, and primarily, labour for the Meat that perisheth; and will he here again cry out, *What Logick, or what Grammar will endure this?*

Ans. 2. Secondly, I ask what Grammar will not endure it? I have already shew'd, the Hebrew and the Greek of the Septuagint do use the Phrase in this Sense; as for the Latins nothing is more common with them than to express an ardent Love, by saying, *In amore est totus, unice amat, toto pectore diligit, omni studio aliquem amplectitur*: In French it is as common to say, *Je vous aime de tout mon cœur*: We teach our very Children to say, *I love my Dad, I love my Mam with my whole Heart*; nothing therefore being more ordinary in every Language than to use this Expression, when we do not in the least intend to signify the Person we thus love, is loved exclusively of all others, but only that he is
very

very much beloved by us: Why may not the Scripture say this of that God we are obliged to love above all things, and before all things, and so as to love other things only in Subordination and Relation to him; loving none other with that Love which is due and proper to him? For as we are commanded to *serve him only*, and yet may serve our King, our Master, and our Friend; to *fear him only*, and yet may fear our Parents, our Superiors and Masters, because we do not serve them with that Religious Worship, nor fear them with that Reverence which is due to God alone: So may we love the Creature with a love of Desire, and our Neighbour with a love of Benevolence, and yet love God only with that Desire and Benevolence which is due to him alone. When Mr. N. proposeth this Objection against his own Opinion, That *if the Love of God required our whole Affection, we could not love our Neighbour as our selves*, he is forced to Answer thus, that “ *If the Love of God, and of our Neighbour* Serm. p. 71.
“ *were of the same Kind, that entire Love of*
“ *the former would indeed exclude the latter;*
“ *but this is not the Case, we are not here supposed*
“ *to love God in the same Sense, or with the same*
“ *sort of love wherewith we love our Neighbour.*
So, say I, is it in our case, we do not love the Creature *with the same sort of Love, or in the same Sense* in which we love God, i. e. not with a Religious Affection, but with a Natural only; not as our Spiritual, but as our Temporal Good; not as the Good of our Immortal Souls, but our Frail Bodies; not as our End, our Rest, or our chief Good, not for

Duſt. Dub.
L. 4. ch. 2.
R. 2. n. 9,
10, 11. p.
524, 525.

Let. 8. p.
158.

for its own, but for God's ſake ; whereas we love God with a religious Affection, as the Spiritual and Eternal Good of our Immortal Souls, as our End, Reſt, and our chief Good, and even for himſelf : For *this he doth*, ſaith the Excellent Biſhop Taylor, *who loves God above every thing elſe, for all that ſupereminent Love by which God is more loved than all the World, all that Love is pure, and for himſelf: For the Philoſophers were wont to ſay, A Man loved Virtue for Virtues ſake, if he loved it when it was diſcountenanced, when it thwarted his temporal Ends and Proſperities ; and what they call loving Virtue for Virtues ſake, the Chriſtian calls loving God for God's ſake.* And had Mr. N. when he ſaid, *There are but two ſorts of Love, that of Deſire, and Benevolence*, conſidered that this love of Deſire may be branched into religious and natural Deſires, deſire of things Spiritual and Temporal, of things good for the Body and for the Soul, of things to be uſed here, and to be enjoyed here and hereafter, of things as neceſſary for our being and our well-being, of things to be deſired for their own and for God's ſake ; He would have diſcerned as great a difference betwixt one Love of Deſire and another, as betwixt Love of Deſire and of Benevolence ; or at the leaſt would not have thought that he who deſired the Creature in a ſenſe thus limited, deſired him *in the ſame ſenſe*, or *with the ſame ſort of Deſire* with which his Love and his Deſire is carried out towards his Great Creator. So that I need not now to advertiſe him, that he ſhould not inſiſt ſo much on the Engliſh Particle *wiſh*, ſince the Original
Greek

Greek from whence these words are cited, ran thus, *Thou shalt love the Lord, με ελως τ ης καρδιας, from the whole Heart*; now sure we may love one thing *ex animo*, from the whole Heart, and desire it entirely, and yet may also sometime employ our desires upon other things?

The Second Objection from Scripture is §. 2. taken from the words of the *Apostles James* Object. 2. and *John*; the words of the *Apostle James* are these, *Ye Adulterers and Adulteresses, know James 4. 4. ye not that the Friendship of this World is enmity to God? Whosoever therefore will be a Friend of the World, is an Enemy to God.* Whence he infers, that in *St. James's* account our Heart is p. 66. so much *God's Propriety and peculiar*, and ought so entirely to be devoted to him, that 'tis a kind of *Spiritual Adultery* to admit any Creature into Partnership with him in our Love.

I Answer, That as a Woman becomes not an Adulteress by any Affection to, or Friendship with another Man, for she ought to love her Friend, and Neighbour, and Relations, and to shew Friendship to them, but only by loving Friend or Neighbour with the love proper to her Husband, with that love which comes in competition with, and invades that conjugal Affection which belongs to him alone. So neither doth all love of the Creature make us guilty of *Spiritual Adultery*, but only that love of the Creature which is proper to God, and stands in com-

Ans.

Si autem amaveris hac quamvis Deus feceris & neglexeris creatorem, & amaveris mundum nunc tuus Amor Adulterinus deputabitur. August. in Ep. Joh. To. 9. Tr. 2. p. 592.

H

petition

petition with him, and makes us Idolize the Creature, by giving it that share in our Affections which is due to God alone, as is evident from the very words, *Ye Adulterers*

and *Adulteresses*; for that

* Πορνείαν τὰ εἰδωλολατρεῖαν καλεῖ, αἱ δὲ διὰ συνημύνας, καὶ ἀνακείμεναι ψυχὰς εἶτα τὴν πορνείαν παύσαι, καὶ τὴν ἡδονῶν ἀσπαζόμεναι συνήθειαν, εἰκότως μεταχέτεται χρηματίζεσθαι. Theodo. in Ezek.

23. 20. Hence are the Idolatrous Jews filed the Seed of the Adulterer and the Whore, Isa. 57. 3. And said to commit Adultery with Stones and Stocks, Jer. 3. 9. With their Idols, Ezek. 23. 37. And to go a Whoring after other Gods, Judg. 2. 17. Pl. 73. 27. Pl. 106. 39.

* Phrase, as often as it Metaphorically occurs in the Old Testament, imports the declining of the Jews to Idolatry, and the giving that Worship and Service to Idols and false Gods, which belongs only to the true; and consequently that Friendship of the World which rendred the Persons here represented, Guilty of *Spiritual Adultery*, must be that inordinate Affection to the World which made it

Rival God, and Rob him of the Service and Obedience due to him; and this the Context clearly shews, for the Friendship of the World there reprehended was such as proceeded from the Lusts which were in their Members, and caused them to desire the World's Good, not to supply their wants, but to consume them on their Lusts, and such a love of the World as produced Wars, Fagbrings, and even Murders, that they might obtain the Worlds good things, ver. 1, 2, 3, 4.

Serm. p. 67.

But, saith Mr. N. "Every lover of the Creature is in proportion an Idolater upon our former Principle; for by loving Creatures we suppose them our Goods, that they are able to act upon our Souls, and affect

“ affect them with pleasing Sensations, that
 “ they perfect our Being, and are the causes
 “ of our Happiness, which is to suppose them
 “ to be so many Gods; so that there can be
 “ no such thing as loving the World with mode-
 “ ration, since we ought not to love it at all,
 “ for we Deifie the Object of our Love; and to
 “ affect the Creature in any degree, is so far
 “ to Idolize it. To this I Answer,

First, If there can be no such thing as loving, i.e. *Ans. 1.*
 desiring the Creature with moderation, why doth *Namquid non*
 the Scripture prescribe this Moderation as to the *est in his mo-*
 things of this World, by saying, *Let your mo-*
 deration, as to these things, be known unto all, *du? S. Au-*
 the Lord is at hand. Be careful for nothing, but *gust.*
 in every thing by Prayer and Supplication with *Phil. 4. 4.*
 Thanksgiving, let your requests be made known
 unto God. Are not our Petitions of these
 things from God our desires of them? Is not
 our dependance on that Providence for them,
 which will give good Things to them that
 ask them, the Remedy here prescribed against
 our anxious Cares for these things? And
 must not then the Moderation here required
 Respect the same things? Again, Brethren, *1 Cor. 7.*
 saith the Apostle, *the time is short, it remaineth* *29, 30.*
that both they that have Wives, be as if they had
none; and they that weep, as though they wept not;
and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not;
and they that buy, as though they possessed not; and
they that use this world, as not abusing it: For
the Fashion of this world passeth away. Here do
 not all the Ancient Commentators agree that
 the Apostle prescribes mediocrity as to these
 transitory Things we can enjoy but for a
 short time? And that by commanding us to

A Discourse of

Τὶ ὃ ἐάν τις μὴ ἔχοντες, ἀνὴς
 τῷ ὃ προσηλαίμενοι, ἔδὲ πᾶσαν τὴν
 σπουδὴν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἰσχυρὸν καὶ τὰς γυναῖ
 κας ἀγαλίσκοντες, αὐτῷ τῷ ὃ
 αὐτὸν τὸν ὃ ἄλλων, καταχεῖται,
 τῷ ὃ τῷ ὃ αὐτῷ τῷ ὃ πᾶσι
 σπουδῆς, καὶ τὸ ὃ αὐτῷ τῷ ὃ
 δουίας. Theoph. vide Theo-
 doret & Oecum in locum.

have and use them as if we
 did it not, he only doth
 enjoin us not to have our
 hearts affixed, and our chief
 care employ'd about them;
 and that to abuse the world
 is thus to use it to the Satis-
 faction of our Lusts, or so
 as to employ all our Studies
 and Affections on it; doth
 not the Apostle himself

thus explain our weeping for our lost Friends,
 1 Theſ. 4. 13. viz. That we should not do it inmoderate-
 ly; and is not that sufficient warrant, so to
 interpret the other Particulars? And since
 these words respect the Moderation of our
 Joy and Grief, and we do joy and grieve ac-
 cording as we do affect the Objects of those
 Passions; why should they not be also deem-
 ed to respect the Moderation of our Affection
 to, or our desires of this World?

Secondly, If we Deifie the Object that we love,
 we Deifie every Woman that we love in
 order to Matrimony; every Child and Rela-
 tion we desire to preserve, that so we may
 enjoy the Benefit and Comfort of their Pre-
 sence; we Deifie our selves when, accord-
 ing to the Psalmist, we desire life and love many
 days; yea, we Deifie all the Meat and Drink
 we love, and therefore do desire to eat and
 drink of; and if I love and desire a Cup of
 good Wine, because it maketh glad the Heart
 of Man, I am, ipso facto, an Idolater.

Thirdly, I deny that it is necessary that he
 who loves, i. e. desires any Creature (suppose
 Meat when he is hungry, or Drink when
 thirsty)

thirsty) must suppose that Creature perfects his Being, and is the cause of his Happiness; or that it is able to act upon his Soul, and affect it with pleasing Sensations: 'Tis only necessary that he should suppose those pleasing Sensations will follow upon the Enjoyment of those Creatures, and are not to be had without them; for put case a Sensual voluptuous Man were of your Opinion, would he ever the less pursue the delights of the Flesh, and of the sensual Appetites? Is it not the Pleasure annexed to the Enjoyment of these things which all the World pursue? And must they not then have the same reason to desire and pursue them, while the same Pleasures are annexed to the Enjoyment of them, whoever be the efficient cause of that Pleasure, or whatever it be that acts upon the Soul, and affects it with these pleasing Sensations?

Fourthly, It cannot be Idolatry to suppose God acts upon my Soul by the virtue he hath put into a Creature, rather than immediately by himself; for then all the World must have been Idolaters before Mr. M. and Mr. N. *Serm. P. 11.* made known this new Opinion to the World; for he confesses that among the whole Tribe of Philosophers that went before them none of them thought any otherwise, or any farther, but universally held, that Bodies had a power of producing such Sensations: 'Tis also evident that Children for a long time taste the Pleasures of the Creatures before they can be able to discern that God immediately produces these pleasing Sensations in them; and that the Generality of the World are still incapable of knowing that he doth so. Now is not

A Discourse of

this to vilifie the Providence and Wisdom of God, and to reproach his Goodness to say, That he hath laid the World under a sad necessity of *defrauding God of his Worship*, and *committing* that Sin of Idolatry, which *be that* *1 Cor. 6. 9, doth*, *saith the Apostle, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.* Moreover all Idolatry implies an act of Religious Worship, though misplaced; now do we by desiring Meat when we are hungry, or Drink when thirsty, or by thus loving Meat and Drink as things which may gratifie our hungry or our thirsty Appetites, by the virtue God himself hath implanted in them, worship Bread and Drink? All religious Worship proceeds from a direct immediate Intention, either to give Honour to that which we conceive to be God, or else ascribes to the Object worshipped some of the Divine Attributes, or Essential Perfections; but do we conceive Bread and Drink to be God, by asking them of God, *that is*, desiring them, or by rejoicing in them as his Blessing, *i. e.* being pleased, or affected with them as such, or by conceiving he hath put any virtue into them to do us Good? Do we ascribe unto the Creature any of the Divine Attributes or Perfections, or say in effect they are *Omnipotent*, by thinking God may enable them to raise pleasing Sensations in us; or to work upon our Animal Spirits, and by them upon our Souls? Surely could there be any semblance of Idolatry in this case, it must wholly lie not in conceiving that Creatures can move our Animal Spirits, which is all we say or think they do, but in conceiving that these Animal Spirits can act upon

1 Cor. 6. 9,

10.

Gal. 5. 20,

21.

Eph. 5. 5,

Apoc. 22.

15.

upon the Soul, and that these Motions of them can be grateful, or ungrateful to it?

The words of the *Apostle John* run thus, §. 3.
Love not the World, neither the things that are Object.
in the World; if any Man love the World, the 1 John 2.
love of the Father is not in him: For all that is 15, 16, 17.
in the World, the Lust of the Flesh, the Lust of
the Eyes, and the Pride of Life is not of the Fa-
ther, but is of the World. And the World passeth
away, and the Lusts thereof, but he that doeth
the will of God abideth for ever. "Here you Serm. p. 65,
 " have again all Love of the World expressly 66.
 " forbidden, as altogether inconsistent with Nun hoc dici-
 " the Love of God; not the immoderate Love tur sed sit mo-
 " of the World only: For, 'tis plain that the dus propter
 " words import a great deal more, namely, Creatorem.
 " That we are not to love the World at all; that August. in
 " all Love of it is immoderate. locum.

To this the Reverend Dr. *Barrow* Answers, *Answ.*
 that " The *Apostle* explains himself, that by Serm. Vol. 1.
 " the World he means those things which p. 318.
 " are most generally embraced and practised
 " in it; the Lust, or the desire of the Flesh, that
 " is Sensuality and Intemperance; the Lust
 " of the Eyes; that is Envy, Covetousness,
 " vain Curiosity, and the like; the Ostenta-
 " tion or Boasting of Life, that is Pride, Am-
 " bition, vain Glory, Arrogance, Qualities
 " as irreconcilably opposite to the Holy Na-
 " ture and Will of God, so altogether incon-
 " sistent with the Love of him, begetting in
 " us an Averſation and Anripathy towards
 " him, rendring his Holiness distasteful to our
 " Affections, his Justice dreadful to our Con-

Sciences, and Himself consequently, his Will, his Law, his Presence hateful to us. And that this is the true import of the words, is highly probable; 1. Because *these things*, saith the Apostle, *are not of the Father*: Whereas the moderate Desire of, and Affection to the World's Good things, is of that God who hath implanted in us natural Affections and Propensions to them, made them the Objects of our Desires and our Industry, encouraged us to affect them by making the matter of his Promises, and hath allowed us to rejoice in them. 2. Because he saith, *He that loveth the World, the love of the Father is not in him*, which cannot possibly be true of that Relative and Subordinate Love unto it, which he hath made Provisions for.

Again, if we understand by these things, the desire of those things which gratifie our Appetites with Pleasure, *V. G. by the Lusts of the Flesh*, the desire of Meat, Drink, and voluptuous Enjoyments, as they do gratifie the Flesh; by *the Lust of the Eye*, the desire of Gold, Silver, large Possessions, noble Houses, rich Furniture, fair Gardens, as they do gratifie the Eye. By *the Pride of Life*, the desire of Places of Dignity, Noble Titles, all the Honour and Glory of the World, as they gratifie our Thirst of Honour. Hath he not told us, That the pleasing Sensations which produce these desires in us are *not of the World*, *i. e.* the things contained in it, but of *the Father*; that they are *the natural, genuine, and direct Effects of God*; that 'tis of *the proper Nature of God to produce them*; that *he wills them for themselves, and naturally delights in them*, and

and therefore sure would have us to will and delight in them, and consequently to desire them. What then remains but that we should understand by the love and desire of these things, that immoderate love and desire which tends to captivate our Affections to them; and to prevail upon us to transgress the Will of God, that we may enjoy or preserve them, that is, the immoderate love and desire of these things.

I proceed now to consider what Mr. N. objects from reason against our Relative Affection to the Creature, *i. e.* our love of it in Relation to God. §. 4.

Now "as, saith he, to worship
"the Creature, though but Rela-
"tively, is to give that Worship to
"the Creature which is proper to
"to God, so to love the Creature
"though but relatively, is in like
"manner to give that love to the
"Creature which is proper to God;
"and if this be thought a sufficient
"reason to disallow of a Relative
"Worship, I cannot see why we should not,
"for the same reason, give Sentence against
"this Relative Love; or why one should
"not be reckoned *Idolatry* as well as the o-
"ther.

*Minus te amat Dominus
qui tecum aliquid amat
quod propter te non amat.
Aug. Solil. c. 19.*

*Non ista propter se sed
ista propter illum diligas.
Med. c. 4.*

To this I Answer, (1.) That Mr. N. was formerly of another mind; for in his Discourse of *Platonick Love* he speaks thus, "Because
"God is of too sublime and refined Excel-
"lency to be fastned on immediately by our
"Love,

Ans.
p. 443.

“ Love, *Plato* recommends to us *a method of Ascent*, which is from loving the Beauty which we see in Bodies, to pass on to the love of that Beauty which we see in the Soul; from the Beauty of the Soul, to the Beauty of Virtue; and lastly, from the Beauty of Virtue, to the immense Ocean of Beauty; and these, saith he, are the Steps of the Sanctuary. Now do we not find here all that Mr. N. condemns in our Relative Love? viz. the love of the Creatures by way of Relation to God, not as the only, but the final and ultimate Object of our Love; a love of that Creature for God’s sake, or in Relation to God, provided that it do not stop and fix at the Creature, but run on till at last it fix upon God as its final Object.

Serm. Vol. 3.
p. 75.

Ranf. and
Rel. p. 244.

P. 246

Again, We ought, saith he, to make God the direct and primary Object of our Love, and to love nothing for its self, but only in and for God. In his Aspiration he speaks thus, My God, I will love thee as thou teachest me; the first and direct Motion of my Love shall be towards thee; and whatever I love besides thee, I will only love in and for thee. And doth he not here say, that he is taught of God to love other things besides God for his sake?

Self. 2, 3.

Self. 5.

In his Essay upon Contemplation and Love, he saith, God ought to be the ultimate end of all our Actions; and we ought not in any of our Actions (and therefore not in our Love) to stop short of this Center, but in all our Actions to make a farther Reference either actual or habitual. And again, An end may become evil by being rested in, when it is not the last, without any farther respect or reference. So that ’tis the want of this respect

respect and reference, which renders the love of the Creature evil.

And now to shew what little cause he had to parallel this Relative Love of the Creature, with the *Relative Worship* we condemn in the Church of Rome, and so unhappily to pronounce all Christians Guilty of *Idolatry*, who love any thing besides God for his sake, I need only to remind him of a few things which, had they been considered, would have put him out of love with this Comparison, viz.

First, That the distinction of *Relative Worship* is proper to the Worship of *Images*, which can deserve no Worship for themselves, but as they represent some Object which deserveth Worship: Now to say thus of all inferior good things, that they can deserve no Love, or cannot be desirable for any real Goodness God hath put into them, is to beg the Question.

Secondly, That we only charge them with *Idolatry* in Worshipping the *Cross*, and the *Images* of God, and Christ with *Latria*, i. e. for giving the same Worship which they give

Motus qui est in Imaginem quantum est Imago, est unus & idem cum illo qui

est in Rem; & sic sequitur quod eadem reverentia exhibetur Imagini Christi & ipsi Christo: Cum ergo Christus adoratur adoratione latriæ, consequens est, quod ejus Imago sit adoratione latriæ adoranda. Aquin. Sum. Part. 3. Q. 25. Art. 3.

Sententia D. Thome quatenus docet eodem actu adorationis coli Imaginem, & exemplar per illam representatum est verissima piissima, & fidei decretis admodum consona. Petr. de Cabrera in 3. Part. Th. Q. 25. Art. 3. Disp. 3. N. 56.

Dicendum ergo primò est fieri rectè posse ut Prototypum in Imagine & Imago cum Prototypum actu adoretur, atque hoc modo posse Imaginem Christi adaptari Latriæ. Suarez in 3. Part. Th. To. 1. Disp. 54. Sect. 4.

to God and Christ, to the Cross, and to the Image, which is a Creature of their own making. Now can Mr. N. charge us with giving the same love to the Creature which we give to the Creator? Moreover, we charge them with *Idolatry*, for doing this with *the same Individual inward and outward Act*; now can Mr. N. charge us with loving the Creature by the same Individual desire with which we love God.

Thirdly, The Relative Worship which they do give to *Images* is plainly forbid in the Second Commandment, but as this cannot be said of this Relative Love without begging the Question; so I have sufficiently proved already, that it is highly approved in the *Holy Scriptures*, That God hath made Provisions for it, accepts of it, and doth encourage us to perform it, as will be still more evident by an Instance proper to this Subject, *viz.*

- Mr. N. doth, and must allow a Relative Love of Benevolence to the Creatures, *Christ* having so expressly said for the Encouragement
- Mat. 25. 40. of our Charity to his Servants; *For as much as you did it to one of these little ones, my Brethren,*
- Mark 9. 41. *you did it unto me.* And again, *Whoever shall give you a Cup of cold Water in my Name, because you belong to Christ, shall not lose his reward.* And
- Hebr. 6. 10. the Apostle, that God is not unrighteous to forget *your* labour of love that you have shewed to his name, in that you have ministered to the Saints, and do mi-
- Pro. 19. 17. nister. And Solomon, that He that hath pity on the poor, lendeth to the Lord. In all which cases there is a love of the Creature for God's sake, or in Relation to God; a love of the Creature in a Relative, transitive way; a love of them
- termi-

terminating upon God and Christ, and yet a Love highly acceptable to God, and such as he hath promised richly to reward; but then it is not love of the same kind with that Affection which I owe to God, as being not an *Elicite*, or an *immediate Act of Religion*, as is the love of God, but only an *Imperate Act* of it, as the *Schools* speak; it proceeds not from the same act which carries me directly to God, the love of God being the Cause, that of Man the Effect; it is not done by any act of my mind *joining God and the Creature together, as one integral Object*, but it is love to the Creature for that Relation which it hath and bears to God and Christ, and therefore 'tis not a forbidden, but a very acceptable kind of Love, though it be plainly Relative.

And so it is also in our Love of Desire to the Creature; for I love them for God and for Christ's sake, when I desire them that I may have wherewith to feed Christ's hungry, and clothe his naked Members, and in all the other Instances fore-mentioned. 'Tis therefore evident, that this Relative Love, and the *Papists Relative Worship of Images*, are so far from being *exactly Parallel*, as Mr. N. asserts, that they have nothing common to each other but this, that both are stiled Relative, which also happens in that love of Benevolence for God's sake, he allows of.

But saith Mr. N. "Either Creatures are truly and really lovely, as being our true and proper Good, or they are not; if they are

S. S.
Object,

" are, then a Relative Love is too little ; we
 " ought to love them with more than a Re-
 " lative Love ; we ought to love them abso-
 " lutely and for themselves ; but if they are
 " not, then even a Relative Love is too much ;
 " for what is not truly lovely, is always
 " loved too much, if it be lov'd at all : So
 " that either way there is no pretence for
 " admitting this last Expedient of our Con-
 " cupiscence, the Relative Love of the Crea-
 " ture.

Ans.

To this I Answer, That when he saith,
The Creature is not our true and proper Good,
 this may be taken in the most elevated
 Sense, in which God only is our *true and pro-
 per Good*, and then his Argument runs thus
 Either Creatures are to be loved as our God,
 or else they are not to be loved at all ; and
 this Consequence I hope is not *as clear as the
 day* ; or it may be taken in a large sense for
 that which is the Good of the whole Man,
 Soul and Body, and then also I deny that
 what is not thus lovely, is not to be loved at
 all ; for I may love, because I may desire my
 daily Bread, though it be not the proper
 Good of my Soul, but of my Body only.
 Or lastly, our true and proper Good may
 signify that only which is some way condu-
 cing to our Good, to the Advantage and
 Comfort of this present Life, as being instru-
 mental to the Sustainment, and the Content-
 ment, and Pleasure of this Life, or to our
 Preservation from those afflictive Evils which
 are incident to us in this Life ; and all that in
 this

this lower sense is lovely, may be loved, and yet not loved * absolutely, and for it self, as that excludes the Subordination of that Affection to the love of God, since thus we are not to desire Life it self, but as this Life conduceth to God's Glory, which is the soveraign end of all our Actions.

* Non te prohibet Deus amare ista, sed non diligere ad beatitudinem, sed ad hoc probare & laudare ut amor creatorum. August. in Ep. Joh. To. 9. Tr. 3. P. 592.

Secondly, Therefore I add, That Creatures *Answ. 2.* may be said to be loved absolutely, and for themselves, either as that imports only for the Goodness God hath put into them, the Good they do, the Pleasure they afford to our natural Appetites; and in this sense I have proved they may be loved absolutely, and for themselves, and this I also learn from these words of Mr. N. "The Great Author of Nature hath *Contempl. and* made Provisions for the Entertainment of our *Lvs, p. 299.* "natural Faculties, and particular Appetites; all "our Senses, Seeing, Hearing, Tasting, Smelling, "and Touching have their proper Objects and "Opportunities of Pleasure respectively; and the "Enjoyment and Indulgence of any of those Ap- "petites is then only, N.B. and in such Circum- "stances restrained, when the greater Interests of "Happiness are thereby crossed and defeated.

Now sure I may desire that Pleasure of Appetites which God hath made provision for, and consequently may desire those particular Objects which afford that Pleasure, since otherwise that Provision God hath made for the Entertainment of our Animal Faculties must be made in vain. Again, if the Enjoyment of, and the Indulgence of these Appetites is
only

*Nid. p. 308,
309.*

only then restrained, when the great Interests of Happiness are thereby cross'd and defeated; then the Enjoyment of, and the Indulgence to them is not wholly restrained, and then the desire of that Enjoyment and Indulgence to them is not entirely restrained, and therefore in some measure, and in some Circumstances is allow'd. He also owns, that *Some repast may be found in the Creature, and that it is Good to be chosen, though not to be rested in; and may I not then desire that Repast? May I not love what is Good to be chosen with a love of Concupiscence?*

But, 2dly, to love Creatures *absolutely*, and *for themselves*, may signifie to love them exclusively of a Relation to, and the Subordination of that love to God; and in this sense they are not to be loved absolutely, and for themselves.

*1 Cor. 10.
31.*

1st. Not exclusively of a Relation of them, and our affection to them to God's Glory, seeing *whether we eat, or drink, or whatever we do, we are to do it all to the Glory of God.*

Nid. p. 316.

2dly, Not exclusively of the Subordination of the love of them to the love of God, because we must still love them with that Moderation and Indifferency, which will not permit our Affection to them to hazard or obstruct our pursuit of the Supreme Good. For, saith Mr. N. *Whenever we turn the edge of our Desire to Created Good, 'tis Prudence, as well as Religion, to use Caution and Moderation, and gage the Point of our Affection, least it run too far.* Where again he plainly allows of some affection to, and some desire of Created

ted Good, and if Prudence and Religion require Caution and Moderation in the use of those Affections and Desires, they, by so doing, do approve them in some measure, for there can be no Caution or Moderation of our Affections and Desires to that which must not be at all affected or desired.

I

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The Contents.

Mr. N. grants, That we may seek, and use sensible things for our Good, but, saith he, we must not love them as our Good; and that we may approach to them by a bodily Movement, but not with the Movements of the Soul. This is Examined, and Confuted, §. 1. Argument 1. That God is the sole Cause of our Love, and therefore hath the sole Right to it. Answered, §. 2. Argument 2. The Motion of the Will is to Good in General, i. e. to all Good, and therefore to God only. Answered, §. 3. Argument 3. God is the end of our Love, since he cannot act for a Creature, but only for himself, or move us to a Creature, but only to himself. Answered, §. 4. Argument 4. That God cannot be loved too much, nor the World too little. Answered, §. 5. Argument 5. That God having called us thus to the Love of himself, cannot afterwards send us to a Creature, §. 6. Argument 6. A Man cannot repent of placing his whole Affection upon God, or have any thing to Answer for on that account. Answered, §. 7. Argument 7. God only is to be loved, because

the Love of God.

115

cause he only acts upon our Spirits, produceth our Pleasure, and he only does us Good. Answered, §. 8. What the Lady offers on this Subject briefly Considered, and Answered, §. 9.

HAVING thus considered the Arguments produced from Scripture against the common Interpretation of this Great Commandment, and for a love of God wholly exclusive of all love to, and desire of the Creature, even so far, and so unhappily exclusive of it, that we are told, That he that desires any thing besides God, whatever he pretend, or however he deceive himself, doth not truly love God; That the desire of God, and desire of the Creature are in their own Nature incompatible, even so incompatible, that whenever the Soul moves towards the Creature, it must necessarily forsake the Creator. I now proceed to the Examination of those Arguments from Reason, by which Good Mr. Norris and the Lady endeavour to establish this Opinion, only premising for the better stating of the Question,

Him only shalt thou desire.
Serm. p. 11.

Lett. 9. p. 202, 203.

p. 201.

p. 203.

What he, and the Good Lady grant to us.
And,

First, They own, That we may seek and use those sensible things to which, by the Order of Nature, Pleasure is annexed; That they may be innocently sought for and used, though they must not be loved; That we may seek and use sensible things for our Good, but we must not love them as

§. 1.
Serm. Vol. 3.
p. 73, 74.
Lett. 4. p. 79.

A Discourse of

*Theory and
Reg. of Love,*
P. 10.

our Good. Which in plain terms is affirming and denying the same thing, as is demonstrable from Mr. N.'s definition of the *love of Concupiscence*, for *Pleasure*, saith he, *is Good*, even *our Good*, seeking *Pleasure* must suppose a desire of it; and that desire is *Love*, or the effect of *Love*; for it supposeth a *motion of the Soul* towards it, and *Love*, saith he, *is only a Motion of the Soul towards Good.*

Serm. p. 9.

Again, seek and use sensible things for our Good we cannot, whilst we suppose they are not Good for us, *i. e.* that they will do us no Good, if then we may seek, and use sensible things for our *Pleasure*, and our Good, they must do us Good, and so be our Good: For *That*, saith he, *is our Good, which does us Good.*

P. 72.

Luk. 12. 29.

1 Cor. 10.
24.

Col. 3. 1, 2.

Moreover it may be enquired why he is so indulgent to our seeking of these things, who will not permit us to love them in the least measure, and who contends for an utter annihilation of all desire of the Creature; does not our Saviour say as expressly, *Seek not what you shall eat, or what you shall drink*; as St. *John* doth, *love not the World*? Does not his *Apostle* say as expressly, *μὴ τίς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητεῖτω*, *Let no Man seek his own things*? And can he tell us any reason why of two things equally prohibited, we may be allowed the one, and not the other, or why the Prohibition of loving or desiring the Creature should be entirely exclusive of all love and all desire of the Creature, and yet the prohibition of seeking and minding the Creature should not be as exclusive of all seeking and all minding of it? But to proceed: *This,*

This, saith he in his Letter, I farther illustrate thus, you are to distinguish betwixt the 75, 76. Lett. 4. p.
Movements of the Soul and those of the Body; the Movements of the Soul ought not to tend but towards him who only is above her, and only able to act in her, but the Movements of the Body may be determined by those Objects which environ it; and so by those Movements we may unite our selves to those things which are the Natural or Occasional Causes of our Pleasure, thus because we find Pleasure from Fire, N. B. this is warrant enough to approach it by a Bodily Movement, but we must not therefore love it; for Love is a Movement of the Soul: And that we are to reserve for him who is the true cause of that Pleasure which we resent by occasion of the Fire; who, as I have proved, is no other than God, by which you may plainly perceive what 'tis I mean, by saying, that Creatures may be sought for our good, but not loved as our Good. But this, saith he, is more intelligible than practicable. But,

1. Is this Philosophy suitable to the Language of the Holy Ghost; doth he speak as if we sought and approach'd the Creature only by a Bodily Movement, and not with any Movements of the Soul. Doth not he say, *Not- Deut. 12.1*
withstanding thou mayst kill and eat flesh in all 15.
thy Gates, whatsoever thy Soul lusteth after, according to the Blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee. When the Lord thy God Ver. 20.
shall enlarge thy Borders, and thou shalt say, I will eat flesh because thy Soul longeth to eat Flesh, thou mayst eat Flesh whatsoever thy Soul lusteth after. Thou shalt kill of thy Herd, and of thy Ver. 21.

Deut. 14.
26.

*Ita ut nulla
re careat
quam animo
suo possit ex-
petere.*
Eccles. 6. 2.

Flock which the Lord hath given thee, and thou shalt eat in thy Gates whatsoever thy Soul lusteth after, נֶפֶשׁ בְּכָרְ אִמְרָא, with all the desire of thy Soul, thou mayst eat, saith the Hebrew thrice; Thou must do it only by the Movements of the Body, saith Mr. N. Again, Thou shalt bestow thy Money for whatsoever thy Soul lusteth after, for Oxen, or for Sheep, or for Wine, or for strong Drink, or for whatsoever thy Soul desireth. Where again we find, אִמְרָא נֶפֶשׁ, the desire of the Soul, ἐκδομιαὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, the Concupiscence of the Soul allowed to go forth towards Oxen, and Sheep, and Wine, and strong Drink. The Preacher also laments the Folly of the Man who having Riches, Wealth and Honour in such abundance, that he wanteth nothing which his Soul can desire, and yet he hath not an heart to enjoy them freely, and delight himself in the Good of them. See Isa. 58. 11, 12. Rev. 18. 14. So plainly doth the Holy Ghost contradict this New Philosophy.

2dly, Is it suitable to the Sentiments of Mr. N. when he saith, *There are some things in the World which I love*, N. B. with great passion, such as are Conversation with select Friends, or Men of Harmonical and Tuneable Dispositions, Reading close and fine-wrought Discourses, solitary Walks and Gardens, the Beauty of the Spring, and above all, Majestick and well composed Musick; these I delight in with something-like satisfaction and acquiescence, and the last, could I enjoy it in its highest Perfection, would, I am apt to phansie, terminate my Desires, and make me Happy. Now could he do all this without any Movement of his Soul towards

*Contempl. and
Love, p. 307.*

wards them? Are none of these things truly and really lovely, because they are Creatures? Or must he love them too much, if he love them *Serm. p. 78.*
at all?

3dly, He is here speaking of *seeking the Creatures for our good*: Now hath the Body any apprehensions of what is for our good? Can it desire, or seek any thing under that Notion? Hath it any apprehension of the Objects that make Impressions on it as the natural or occasional Causes of our Pleasure? Doth that find Pleasure from the Fire, or remember that it did so? Is it not evidently the Soul that apprehends, remembers, seeks, desires, and doth all these things? How unintelligible therefore is it to talk of all these things only as Movements of the Body, and and not as Movements of the Soul? To take his own Instance, Do we approach to the Fire by a Bodily movement without desiring the Fire, and expecting Pleasure from it? And is not this desire and expectation a movement of the Soul? Is it not the Soul which moves those animal Spirits into those Parts and Muscles by which we are enabled to approach the Fire by a bodily movement: So that, as far as I am able to perceive, here is nothing true, nothing satisfactory, I had almost said nothing intelligible in this pretended Illustration.

Moreover, when *He, and the Lady*, allow us to move toward these things, only *as the Occasions, not as the Causes of our Good*, I ask, Is not the continuance of my Life and Being good? And is Food only the occasion, is it

A Discourse of

not the means by God appointed for the continuance of Life? Is Physick only the occasion, is it not the means of my Health? Is sleep only the occasion, is it not the means of my Refreshment? And so of the Pleasure that we find in the Recovery of our Health, and the Refreshments of our wearied Spirits?

And lastly, were it true that God is the immediate cause of all the Pleasure that we find in the Creature, was any Body acquainted with this Notion till these latter days? Doth one in Ten thousand now believe it? Are the generality of Men capable of Understanding it? And must not then all who in former Ages did not, and who at present cannot understand, or believe it, lie under a necessity of desiring the Creature, as the true cause of their Pleasure, and so have a movement of the Soul toward it as such? So that this matter is both impracticable and unintelligible.

The Notion also seems as useless, as 'tis unintelligible; for am I not as much obliged to God for the Benefit and Pleasure I receive from any of his Creatures, whether he do immediately produce that Pleasure in me by occasion of them, or doth produce in me those Faculties by which I am enabled to perceive the Pleasure they afford? Is not the Pleasure which reflects from them as occasions, or as natural Causes of it, still the same? And is not the Giver of these Faculties and Creatures the sole Author of it? Is not *causa causa, causa causati*? Must not he who is the efficient cause of all those Faculties by which
I per-

I perceive Pleasure from the Creatures his Providence affords me, be the true efficient cause of all my Pleasure? Is it not the same Kindness to give me Money to build me an House, and to pay my Debts my self, as to build an House or pay my Debts for me, since either way my Debts are equally paid, and my House built, and the Benefit is the same.

In fine, Doth this Notion tend at all to abate or lessen our desires of the Creature? Not at all. For be it supposed, that they are only occasions of our Pleasure, yet are they granted to such occasions as are always attended with this Pleasure, and without which it would not be produced in us by God. If then the Object be as pleasing as it would be, provided God had lodged a power in it to excite this Pleasure in me, and given me Faculties to perceive it without his immediate Operation, as certainly it is, then is it also equally desirable; it being the Pleasure it self, not the efficient of it, that I do desire.

Mr. N. saith, *We must not desire them as our Good, because they do us no Good; they afford us no Pleasure*, but God doth upon occasion of them. A very *Metaphysical* Consideration, which scarce any one regards in the pursuit of his Pleasure, and which will abate no Man's desire of it, for the Gratification of the Appetite, the Enjoyment of the Delight, and the pleasing Sentiment is that thing desired and pursued. Now the Creatures being allowed to be the *positive Conditions* upon which God by his immutable Law and Order stands obliged

obliged to give these Gratifications and Delights, and without which he will not produce in us one of these pleasing Sentiments, must not my pursuit of Pleasure, and desire of it, oblige me to desire and pursue that without which I know I cannot have it, and with which I am sure I cannot want it? they being the *positive Conditions determining the Operation of God*, to produce this Pleasure in me, *i. e.* to give me that which only I desire and pursue, and for which only I desire the Creature. However it is granted,

First, That *we may seek and use sensible things for our Good*; and hence it is inferred, that we may desire and be pleased with, that is, may love them as our Good; because it is the apprehension of them as Good to us, or as things which may do us Good, which moveth us to use and seek them for our Good.

Secondly, 'Tis also granted, That *we may unite our selves, and approach to them by the Movements of the Body*, which Movements of the Body being not Mechanical Motions, but caused by some Movements of the Soul towards them; hence, I conclude, we may approach or unite our selves to them also by some Movements of the Soul; which is the thing denied by Mr. N.

And having premised this, I proceed directly to return an Answer to the Arguments by which Mr. N. endeavours to establish his Opinion, That *the Love of God is exclusive of all Love of the Creature*, and doth require us in Justice to withdraw every straggling Desire from it.

I con-

I confess, the *Incomparable Lady* hath let fall some words, which seem to lay an Imputation of the worst of Follies upon this attempt. Her words are these, " *I will not search for* Lett. 11. p. 260.
 " *Arguments to inforce this Love, after those*
 " *incomparable ones you have so well inculcated,*
 " *which are indeed unanswerable ;* And not to be
 " opposed by any thing, but that which is
 " as unconquerable, as it is unaccountable,
 " wilful Folly. But though these be indeed
 hard Strokes, I'm sure they come from a very
 soft and tender hand, and from as sweet a
 temper'd Soul as lives in Flesh. They there-
 fore must be taken by the right handle, and
 must be thought to be intended as an high
 Compliment to Mr. N. not as an imputation
 of Folly to all that should oppose his incom-
 parable Inforcements of his Tenet. Passing
 them therefore over with this gentle touch,
 I pass on to a Consideration of the Argu-
 ments of Mr. N. contained in his *Sermon*, and
 in his *Letters*.

Then he argues thus, " God is the only Argument 1.
 " Cause of our Love, that is, of that Bent or §. 2.
 " Endeavour whereby the Soul of Man stands Serm. p. 13,
 " inclined to Good in General ; this No- 14, 15.
 " tion of our Souls being a necessary Adhe-
 " rent to our Beings, such as we never were
 " without, and such as we never can put
 " off. Now if God be the only Author and
 " Cause of our Love, has He not then
 " the Sole Right and Title to it ? If He
 " does as much Produce my Love, as He
 " doth my Being, why hath He not as much
 Right

“ Right to my Love, as to any part of my
 “ Nature ?

Ans.

Serm. P. 13
14.

Serm. Vol. 3.
P. 213.

Let. 10. p.
231.

Ans. 2.

Serm. p. 12.

This Argument proves nothing to the purpose, by his own Confession ; for it only proves that God is the Cause of all that Love which is a necessary Adherent to our Beings, such as is all over invincible and irresistible ; of that motion of Love in which we are purely passive, over which we have no more Command, than over the motion of our Heart and Pulse ; which we can never controul ; can never be without ; never can put off ; which the Devils and Damned Spirits, saith he, have, as well as Glorified Saints. Now is this the Love God calls for in this Text ? Is it a purely passive Love which it is not in the Power of Devils to withhold, and in which the greatest Saints cannot excel them ? Is God concerned that we should not want that which is a necessary Adherent of our Beings ? That which we never can put off, never can be without ? Doth he require that only which no Man can defraud him of ? Mr. N. is sensible that the Text is not at all concerned in this Love, confessing that our Free Love is the only Love that falls under Command, and the only one that is in our Power. And why then doth he argue from such a Love, to that Free, Active Love, which too many are without, and too many do put off ; or from that Love which cannot be, to that Love which is commanded. Moreover

This Argument plainly destroys the thing it was designed to establish : For he lays down his Thesis thus, That our whole Affections are to be

be placed on God; and that we are to love him so intirely, as to love none but him. This, saith he, I shall endeavour to establish upon this double Basis, (1.) That God is the only Author, or Cause of our Love. And will it not hence follow, that he is the only Author and Cause of our Natural Love, Bent, and Inclination to every thing besides himself? And can he be the only Author and Cause of our Love to all other things, and yet forbid that very love which he alone produceth in us? God, saith Mr. N. is the Author of all my Love, he hath produced it all, 'tis therefore highly just and reasonable he should have it all. God, say I then, is the Author of all the Love of my self, and of my Preservation, my love of Food, Drink, Cloths, of Honour, Riches, Pleasure, Life, my love of Women, and of Sensual Delights, and of the Gratification of all my Natural Appetites according to, and not exceeding the Intention of (the God of) Nature, which is acknowledged to be Pleasure. And the natural tendency we have to them being from the Author of Nature must needs be right, it being impossible (saith Mr. N.) that God should put a Bias upon the Soul. If therefore it is the Perfection and Duty of every Rational Creature to conform those Determinations of his Will that are free, to that which is natural, or to take care that the Love of his Nature, and the Love of his Choice conspire in one, that they both agree in the same Motion, and concenter in the same Object, as he saith it is, then 'tis the Duty and Perfection of our Nature to chuse to Love, or freely to affect the Preservation of our Life and Being, our Food, Drink,

A Discourse of

Drink, Cloths, Honour, Riches, Pleasure, and the Gratification of all our Natural Appetites according to, and not exceeding the Intention of the God of Nature. Again, God is the Cause and Author of all my Love of my self, of my desire of Self-Preservation, and of all that I judge needful for, and pleasant to me. He is the Author of all that natural *sympathy* we bear to our Relations, and also of that love we owe unto our Neighbour, as having made him in all considerable Respects the same with us, or equal to us, and therefore equally deserving our Affection, and having founded it on this clear Principle of Nature, That *we should deal with others as we would be dealt with.* Will therefore Mr. N. say, That because God is the Author of all this Love of Benevolence, 'tis just and reasonable he should have it all? No sure; the utmost that he can reasonably hence conclude is this, that it is just and reasonable we should only love our selves, our Relatives and Neighbours in relation to God, or in Subordination to him: And this is likewise all he can rationally conclude from God's being the Author of our Love of desire, *viz.* That we should desire nothing, but with Relation to, or in Subordination, and Submission to him.

In a word, as God is the sole efficient Cause of my Intellectual Love in the true *Philosophical* Sense, by giving me the Faculties, and the Liberty by which I chuse Intellectual Good; so also on the same is he the cause of all my sensual Love, *i. e.* of my Love of the Body, of all the Conveniences and innocent Delights

Delights of it, as also the sensual Love of Beasts. And must he therefore be the Proper and Immediate, yea, the *Sole Object* of this Love? Do you not call that a *sensual Desire*, *Let. of Love* whose *Object* is a *sensual Good*? And is God and Musick, such a one? A Man saith Mr. N. is in Love, p. 446. that is, he hath a *sensual Desire* toward a *sensual Good*. And this, saith he, cannot be evil; for *ibid.* p. 447. then 'twould be a sin to be in Love, and consequently there would be a necessity of sinning, in order to Marriage, because no Man (not therefore Mr. N.) is supposed to Marry but whom he thus loves; and so Mr. N. being Married, had once a *sensual Desire* of a *sensual Good* without Sin; and therefore was not obliged by this Commandment to make God the only *Object* of his Love or Desire. And indeed 'tis palpably absurd to say, I do God Injury or Injustice, in loving or desiring those *Serm.* p. 15. things which he hath given me Faculties on purpose to love and desire, which have no other use but to desire, which cannot be satisfied without the Enjoyment of what we desire; which if he did not intend we should Gratifie, he gave them only as Snares and Torments to us. God's Right therefore in this Case can be only this, that I never love any *sensual Good* against him, or to the Dishonour of him, but rather that I love it only in Relation, or in Subordination, and Submission to him, not that I love it not at all.

" I lay down this an evident and unde- *Argument 1.*
 " niable Proposition, that the natural Mo- *S. 3.*
 " tion of the Will is to Good in General. *Let. 10. p.*
 " But ^{224.}

“ But now how can the Will be moved to-
 “ wards Good in General, but by being
 “ moved towards All Good ; for to be mo-
 “ ved towards Good as Good, is to be moved
 “ towards All Good. And how can the
 “ Will be moved towards All Good, but by
 “ being moved towards an Universal Be-
 “ ing who in himself is, and contains All
 “ Good ?

Answ.

This is a piece of *Sophistry*, and a meer Fal-
 lacy ; for when we say the Will is moved to
 Good in General, the meaning of those words
 is only this, *That nothing but what is Good in*
reality or appearance can move the Will, or that
it is always moved by some or other of those things
which are contained within the Compass or the
Sphere of Good ; not that in all its Motions or
 Elections it desires all that can be called
 Good. *V. G.* I desire to eat when I am hun-
 gry, to drink when I am thirsty, to take my
 rest when I am sleepy, not that I think All
 that is Good is contained in my Food, Drink
 or Sleep.

Moreover, to be moved *towards Good as*
Good, is not to be moved *towards All Good,* but
 to be moved towards any particular Object,
sub ratione boni, under this Prospect that it is,
 some way or other, Good for me to enjoy
 that Object ; even as to be moved towards
Evil as Evil, i. e. sub ratione mali is not to be
 moved to all that is evil, but to be moved to
 evil, under the Apprehension or Conviction
 that it is evil, or pernicious to me. And this
 we cannot do ; not *because we have no motion*
from

from God towards it, but to the contrary; which Mr. N. phancies to be the only reason why we cannot possibly Will, or Love evil, as evil. For that would prove as much, that we cannot love Evil at all, under the false appearance of Good; for sure we have no motion to it from God under that false appearance, but to the contrary: Sure the desiring of Evil can in no sense be the natural and proper effect of that great Impression whereby God moves us continually towards himself. But the plain reason of it is, because to Will Evil, as Evil, is to desire it because it is not desirable; which is, to move towards it without a motive. And, *adly*, because 'tis to desire what is pernicious to me, because it is so; which is contrary to the first Principle of self-Preservation God hath planted in us. And hence ariseth also a demonstration, that the Will is not always moved to Good in General, or towards all Good, because it is so often and so powerfully moved to Good apparent only, which being in it self Evil, and only in appearance Good, we can have no motion to it from that God whom, saith he, we move to by moving towards Good in General, nor can it be the effect of that General impression by which God moves us continually to himself.

Mr. N. farther argues thus, " That as God *Argument 3.*
 " is the Author of this motion, so is he the *§. 4.*
 " end of it too, and he moves us to good no *Serm. p. 17.*
 " otherwise than by moving us towards him-
 " self. For can God move us towards the
 " Creature? Can he move us from himself?

K

Can

P. 225, 226.

“ Can he act for a Creature? Can he make
 “ a Creature his end? Does not God make
 “ all things for himself? Is he not always his
 “ own end? Hath not this the evidence of a
 “ first Principle, that God acts only for him-
 “ self? In his *Tenth Letter* this is offered a-
 new in a great Croud of Pompous and Ob-
 scure Expressions. *V. Gr. God cannot act but*
by his Will, that's most certain, (i. e. not by his
Power, not by his Knowledge, not by his
Wisdom, but only by his Will, wonderful
confidence.) But now the Will of God is not,
as in us, an Expression that he receives from with-
out himself, (i. e. I suppose the Word ex-
pression may be the Printers, not the Authors
fault;) and which accordingly carries him out
from himself, but an inward self-centring Prin-
ciple, that both derives from, and terminates in him-
self, (as V. G. his Will to create the World,
and all things in it, his Will to Redeem Man-
kind, his Will to Judge the World.) For as
God is to himself his own Good, his own Center,
and beautiful Object, so the Love of God can be
no other than the Love of himself: Whence it will
follow, that as God must therefore be his own
End, and what ever he Wills, or Acts, he must
Will and Act for himself; so that the Love that
is in us (to Cherries) must be the effect of that
very Love which God hath for himself; there
being no other Principle in the Nature of God (no
Wisdom, Power, Knowledge, &c.) by which
he is supposed to Act. Now, not to insist on
 many other Mistakes contained in this Argu-
 ment, and briefly hinted in the Parenthesis, I
 answer.

First;

First, That whether God can act only for *Ans. 1.* himself, or for a Creature, may easily be determined from these excellent Words of Mr. N. in his *Treatise concerning Perseverance in Holiness*; viz. *When God persuades Men to be Holy*, P. 261. *he persuades every man to that which is best for him, I say best for him; for*

God being already possessed of all possible Perfection, cannot act any thing for any self-advantage; and therefore whatsoever he doth is for the Good of his Creatures. And doth not he act for a Creature, who doth all he doth for the Good of his Creatures? And

therefore, saith he, as God did not at first speak this World into Being, to raise himself a monument of Power, and Divine Architecture; so neither doth he govern the rational part of it by the Precepts of Religion out of any self-design: (Now where he hath no self-design, he can have no self end :) For can a man be profitable to God, as he that is wise may be profitable to himself? Is it any pleasure to the Almighty that thou art righteous, or is it gain to him that thou makest thy way perfect? No certainly. And therefore, when he chalked the ways of Righteousness, and Holiness for men to walk in, it could not be for any self end, but purely for the Good of Man. Now I am apt to think that he who acts not for any self end, acts not always for himself; that he who acts purely for the Good of Man, acts for a Creature, because he acts for the Good of a Creature, and so he acts not only

Deus se vult diligere non ut sibi aliquid, sed ut eis qui diligunt eternum premium conferatur; hoc est ipse quem diligunt. August. de Doct. Christ. l. 1. c. 29.

Ille igitur usus qui dicitur Dei, quo nobis utitur, non ad ejus sed ad nostram utilitatem refertur; ad ejus autem tantummodo binitatem. c. 32.

Her. Piety, for himself. Moreover, he saith, God hath declared that he is only so far pleased with our Services to him, as they are beneficial to our selves. Whence it is easie to conclude, this is the only end of that Command to serve him; for had God any other end, he would be pleased with the obtainment of it. Furthermore, I ask what doth he mean, when he saith, *The Love of God can be no other than the Love of himself?* He hath confidently told us, *There are but these two sorts of Love, love of desire, and love of Benevolence;* and hath delivered it for certain, *That as Indigence in the Lover is the ground of his loving with the Love of Concupiscence;* so Indigence in the Person Loved, is the Ground of loving him with the Love of Benevolence. And thence he hath concluded, that God cannot be loved by us with a Love of Benevolence; because there is nothing we can wish to God which he hath not already. And is not this as much a demonstration, that God cannot love himself with a Love of Benevolence? For what can he wish to himself that he has not already? Nor can God love himself with a Love of Desire: For what Indigence in him can be the Ground of this Love of Concupiscence? What can an infinitely perfect and necessary Being farther desire to himself? How can either of these kinds of self-love derive from him, in whom can be no Indigence; or terminate in him, who is capable of no addition to his infinite and necessary Perfection, and as incapable of any diminution from them? Again, when he saith, *God Wills and Acts for himself,* what doth he mean?

mean? Is it, that he Wills, and Acts for that which he hath already, and cannot chuse but have, or for what he hath not? If the latter, the Question returns, What, can he, who is infinitely and necessarily happy, Will or Act for that he hath not already? If the first, why should he Will or Act for what he hath already, and cannot chuse but have? Can he have it the more for doing so? So unintelligible is this inward self-contriving Principle of Mr. N.

Doth not the Scripture say, God hath made *Object.*
all things for himself? Prov. 16. 4.

I answer, It doth so, according to our Translation; but in the Hebrew the word is *למענה* from *ענה*; and so the words may be thus rendred, the Lord hath made all things to answer to themselves; *וְעַל יְמֵי צָרָתָם*, aptly to refer one to another; even the wicked for the day of Wrath, according to that descant of the Learned Grotius, *Singula Deus ordinat ad id quod singulis convenit; ordinat impium ad diem calamitosum.* The Targum and the Syriac render the words thus, *The Lord doth all things for them that obey, and reserveth the wicked for the evil day.* The Bishop of Ely renders them thus, *The Lord disposeth all things, Lam-maanthu, according to his Will, even the Wicked for the day of wrath, i. e. to be then the Executioners of it.* In a word, had the Hebrew word been *למנוח*, it might have been well rendred *for himself*; but being *למענה*, it seems not to admit of that Translation.

Ans.

vertheless, would he be content with the old Divinity, *That God loves Himself with a Love of Complacency; and that God doth all things for his Glory; and that in this Sense all things are of him, and to him, Rom. 11. 36. 1 Cor. 8. 6. Col. 1. 16.* he would have no Adversary. Only they would be ready to inform him, That

Οὐ γὰρ χρείας ἔνεκον ὁ Θεὸς
παύειν τὸν κόσμον ἵνα πᾶς
ὡς τε ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὡς δι-
ῶν ἢ ἄλλων καὶ δαιμόνων
φύσιν ὁ πλάτων ἐρρητῆ, &c.
Clem. Alexandr. Strom. 5.
p. 585. B. Eadem verba lau-
dat Theodoretus adv. Græcos,
Serm. 4. p. 535.

as it seemed to many of the *Antient Fathers and Philosophers*; so doth it seem to them a vain Imagination to conceive the great design of any of God's glorious Works, and admirable Dispensations should be only this, to be admired and applauded by us worthless Creatures; that

he may gain Esteem, or a good Word from such vile Creatures as we are. We take too much upon us, if we imagine that the All-wise God can be concerned whether such blind Creatures as we are, approve or disapprove of his Proceedings; or that he really can suffer any diminution of his Glory by our dislike, or is advanced in honour by our approbation of his Dispensations. We think too meanly of, and we detract from his Great Majesty, if we conceive that he is tickled with Applause, and chiefly aims at Reputation from us in all his glorious Designs, this being such a weakness in our fellow-Creature, as is stiled Ambition, and *loving of the Praise of Men*, a Crime which he will punish in them; and so it cannot be the great Design of all the Dispensations of his Providence. That there-

therefore, such as we should think well of him can be no farther his concern, than as it serves the nobler Ends of his great Goodness; viz. that these Conceptions may engage us to that Affection to, that Imitation of him, and that Obedience to him, which tends to the promotion of our Happiness.

God therefore acteth for his Glory when he discovers to the World those Excellencies and Perfections of his Nature, which are just motives to the performance of that Duty which we owe unto him; or when he doth display before us those imitable Perfections in which it is our Glory to be like him. But then, it farther is to be observed, that God, in the discovery of these Divine Perfections to the World, designs as well the Benefit and Happiness of Man, as the advancement of his Honour. For when he doth discover all those Attributes which represent him Good and Merciful, kind and obliging to the Sons of Men, he doth it with design, and in a manner very proper to lay the highest Obligations on us to Returns of Love and Gratitude, and to engage us to that Imitation of his Goodness and Mercy to our fellow Creatures, which renders us partakers of the Divine Nature, and helpful to others in all their Exigencies and Distresses. When he gives signal Demonstrations of his Almighty Power, and of his great Wisdom, he designs by this to teach us, that he is able to foresee, and to divert those Evils which may at any time befall us; to rescue us from all our Miseries; and to confer the greatest Blessings on his Ser-

vants; that so he may encourage us to place our Trust in him at all times, to repair by humble Supplications to the Throne of Grace for suitable help in time of need, and to serve him faithfully in expectation of his Favour and Protection. When he manifests himself to be a God of Truth and Faithfulness, one who will punctually perform his promises to, and execute his Threats upon us, he doth this chiefly to affright us from those Sins which make it necessary for his Justice to be severe upon us, and to provoke us to the performance of those Duties to which he hath annexed the greatest Blessings. When he informs us, that his Holiness and Justice cannot permit the Wicked to escape his Vengeance, or any upright Soul to want the tokens of his Love, or the reward of his sincere Obedience, his great design in all this is, that Sin, which is the life of all our Miseries, may be avoided, and Holiness, which is the true advancement, and the best accomplishment of Humane Nature, may be more earnestly pursued by us. So that God's acting for his Glory, is also acting for the Good of his most noble Creatures; tis only recommending himself to their good Liking and Affection, that so he may the more effectually promote their Happiness. Nor is his Will that we should act for his Glory any self-terminating Principle, terminating in himself; but 'tis a Principle of great Good-will and kindness to Mankind, and terminating in his Happiness: Whereas Mr. N's account of God's Love, his Will and Actings, doth render him the

the most selfish Being that we can imagine; one who can love nothing but himself, will and do nothing but purely for himself. Our Charity must be such as seeks not our own things; it must engage us not to seek our own, but every Man another's Good, and to please him for his Good: Our Friendship purely must respect the Welfare of our Friend, and when we exercise our Charity, or pretend Friendship purely from prospect of our own Advantage, our Friendship becomes Mercenary, and our Charity degenerates into Self-love. And to this Charity and Friendship we are incited chiefly by the Example of our God, and yet it seems his Love terminates only in himself, and can be no other than the love of himself; and how then can it oblige me to the forementioned Charity and Friendship to my Neighbour for his sake?

1 Cor. 13. 5.

ch. 10. 23.

Phil. 2. 4.

Rom. 15. 2.

To this Question therefore, Can God move us towards a Creature? Can he move us from himself? I Answer, Yes he doth move us towards the Creatures by all those Appetites, Affections and Desires he hath implanted in our Natures to them, by all the Commands he hath laid upon us to pray for our daily Bread, to be industrious to procure them, and to bless him for them. Does he not move the hungry Appetite to desire Meat, the thirsty Drink, the naked to desire Cloths, the Poor supply of his Wants, &c. And doth he not in all these Cases move us towards the Creature? Hath not God made these things the matter of his Promises, and his Encouragements to Duty? entailing upon Godli-

ness

ness the Promises of this Life? and engaging to them who seek first the Kingdom of God, that all other things shall be added to them? We therefore are by him moved towards the Creature, as a motive to the Enjoyment of himself. And sure thus moving us to the Creature is not to move us from himself, but to himself by means very proper to excite us to love, obey, and cleave unto him who doth thus load us with his Blessings, and poureth his Benefits upon us; as the whole Book of Psalms, and the whole Law of Moses testifies.

Argument 4.

§ 5.

Preface to the Letters.

“ The Love here discoursed of and recommended, is the Love of a God, that is, of all that is Good, of all that is Perfect, of all that is Lovely, of all that is Desirable, in short, of all that truly is; and can any Love be too great or too high for such an Object? Or, rather doth he not deserve infinitely more than we, or any of his Creatures can bestow upon him? What, can infinite Good be loved too much? Or is any degree of Love too high for him who is infinitely lovely, and who infinitely loves himself! — And why then should it be thought such a stretch of the Love of God, to make it intire and exclusive of all other Loves? Can we love God too much, or Creatures too little?

To this I Answer, *First*, That what I have discoursed is sufficient to evince that this is such a stretch of the Love of God, as renders it inconsistent with our Duty, and Obligation to

to pray for any temporal Blessings which we want. That it tends to depreciate the Gifts of God, and to impair the sense of Divine Goodness in them ; to destroy all our Industry in our Callings, and all pursuit of Temporal Enjoyments by our honest Labours ; That it removes the natural Foundation of all Injustice, and cramps all charitable Beneficence ; That it casts a vile Contempt upon the Works both of Creation and of Providence : And lastly, that it casts this imputation upon the Just and Holy God, that he hath made that our Sin, which is Natural and Necessary : As sure it is, to desire Food when we are hungry ; that he will not allow us to desire what he knows we have need of. It makes him to have planted in us natural Appetites and Desires which he intended we should gratifie, and yet hath not permitted us to desire that which alone can gratifie them. And sure, if this *Hypothesis* do all, or any of these things, it by so doing must stretch this Duty of the Love of God beyond the bounds prescribed to it by our God, and Saviour.

Secondly, If God be *all that truly is*, all that is not God, truly is not ; and what is not, can have no Love to God, or any other thing. So that this stretch of *Metaphysics* destroys that Love he recommends. Moreover, to say that God is *all that is Good*, is to contradict God himself, who said of all the Creatures that he made, that *they were very Good* : To say that he is *all that is lovely*, *all that is desirable*, is to beg the Question. Again, that
God

God deserves infinitely more than we can bestow upon him, that an infinite Good cannot be loved too much; i. e. more than he deserves, is very true, but not pertinent; for we can be no more obliged to love God, than we are to serve him as he deserves; which we can never do: For he deserves to be served answerably to the Reward that he hath promised; but can we perform such Service? He deserves Perfect and Angelical Obedience; but are we therefore, in this State of Imperfection, obliged to it? The Question is not, What is too much for him, if we could perform it, but, What he hath made our Duty, and therefore doth expect we should perform. Now hath he made it our Duty so to love him, as not to love our selves; not to love Health and Pleasure, not to desire Food and Raiment, or any other Blessing he hath promised as the Reward of our Obedience? If not, 'tis evident that Duty of Affection which we owe unto him cannot be exclusive of all love of the Creature.

But, Thirdly, the Absurdity of this way of Arguing will best appear by the propounding of some Parallel Instances, as *The Messians*, or *Euchitæ* stretching those words of Christ, which command us to pray always, and not to faint; and those of the Apostle, 1 Thel. 5. 17. pray without ceasing; as Mr. N. doth the Command, to Love God with all our Heart, &c. declared, That they who would be saved, must be continually employed in Prayer, so as to do nothing

καὶ ὅτι ἔστιν thinking, *That the Soul could not be purged by τὸ βάπτισμα them; but only by the Prayer they magnified so ματαίωσι much.*

ἡ ἀνθρώπων

ὅτι ἡ ἐκείνων Μυστηρίων μεταλήψις καθαρίζει τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἢ παρ' αὐτοῖς σπουδαζομένη ἐνέργεια. Damascen. *ibid.* p. 302. Ἀλλὰ μόνον ἡ σπουδαζομένη ἐνέργεια. Theodoret. *Ibid.*

Now, as the *Scriptures*, on which they grounded these Practices, in their *Grammatical Import*, are as full for *Praying always without ceasing*, and against *Labouring for the Meat that Perisheth*, as is the Text under contest for loving God exclusively of any Love of the Creature; so is it easie to Harangue in Favor of these *Hereticks* after the manner of Mr. *N. viz.* “The Duty which we recommend is
 “the desire of Happiness and Salvation, that
 “is, of all that is truly lovely and desirable,
 “of the truest Riches, the Divinest Honours,
 “the most Ravishing Delights, of the Vision
 “of God in Glory, the Enjoyment of him,
 “the being made like him, and seeing him
 “as he is: And can any desire be too Great,
 “or too High for such an Object, or rather
 “doth it not deserve infinitely more than we
 “are able to bestow upon it? What, can
 “an Endless Happiness, and Immense Glory
 “be desired too much? Why then should it
 “be thought such a stretch of the Desire of
 “Happiness, to make it Intire and Exclu-
 “sive of all Labour for the World? Can we
 “love Happiness too much, or the World
 “too little? I appeal to the Judicious Reader
 whether the Argument of the *Massalian Here-
 rick*

rick be not as like to that of Mr. N. as one Egg is to another ; and whether it be not of equal strength with that which he hath here produced.

What he has more to say upon this Subject, is directly levelled against those Persons, if there be any such in the World, who conceive the Love required in the Command, *to love our Neighbour as our selves* is a love, or *desire our Neighbour as our Good*, which I have shewed to be a Contradiction *in adjecto* ; the desire of our Neighbour as our Good being not properly love of our Neighbour, but our selves ; and therefore though some Divines do, and reasonably may, say that Mr. N.'s Exposition of the First Command renders it *inconsistent with the Second*, which requires me *to love my Neighbour as my self*, because it excludes me from the desire of those Creatures by which I may do good to him, and give him the things needful for the Body, as I do to my self ; yet I desire one Instance of one of those *many* who ever said that the Love of our Neighbour in this Precept, *Let. 2. p. 159.* signifies *the desiring him as a Good* ; or of those *P. 157.* Objectors who are pleased to presume this, that so he may in some measure account for his Imagination, that the *World runs so generally P. 172.* upon this Notion. But though neither I, nor I believe any Body else is concerned in any thing he said, as it relates to that Particular ; yet because he so discourses on that Subject as seems to render it as absurd to Love, or desire any other Creature as our Good, I will single out, and accomodate those Passages to

to this matter, and then return an answer to them.

Argument 5.

§. 6.

Let. 8. p.

160, 161.

He therefore enquires thus, "Is it once to be thought that God who is Infinitely Good, Infinitely desirable, Infinitely deserving of our highest Affections, nay of our whole Love, and withal Infinitely able to satisfy and reward it, should command us to love and desire a Creature as vain and infirm, and as much a shadow as our selves? Is it to be thought that he should first call us to himself, and then, as if he alone were not able to suffice for us, and to satisfy the enlarged Appetites which he had given us, should call in the Creatures to part of the Expence, and send us from himself to them? Are these thoughts worthy of God?"

Answer.

What means he by these Questions? Does he not know that the same Jesus who said, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, Soul and Mind*, commanded us to say unto him, *Give us day by day our daily Bread*? And hath he not then commanded us to desire, and so to love what he commandeth us daily to ask of him, whom we thus love with all our Hearts? Was it not usual with him, when he had fed his Hearers with the Bread of Life, the Food that *abideth to Eternal Life*, to feed their Bodies also with his Creatures, and so to send them from the one Food to the other; as knowing well the Bread of Life was never designed to suffice for the Body, or to satisfy those Bodily Appetites which he had given

given them? Again, does he not know, that God commanded his own People to love, and *Deut. 10. 13, 14, 15.* serve him with all their Hearts and Souls; encouraging them to do so by this Promise, that then he would give them Corn, and Wine, and Oil, and they should eat and be full? That the Blessed Jesus exhorts us to seek first the Kingdom of God, and the Righteousness thereof, and then all these things (Meat, Drink and Clothing) should be added to us by our Heavenly Father, who knoweth we have need of them? Doth not St. Paul excite us to live Godly, because Godliness is profitable to all things, having the promise of this Life? Doth not the Psalmist say, O fear the Lord all ye his Saints; for there is no want to them that fear him. The Young Lions do lack, and suffer hunger; but they that seek the Lord shall not want any good thing? And again, The Lord will give Grace, and Glory, and no good thing will be withhold from them that walk uprightly? And hath not God by these Expressions first called us to himself, and then sent us to his Creatures, as his Blessings on our Obedience? Do not those Promises suppose in us a Love of, and a desire to enjoy the Blessings promised? And then doth he not send us to these Creatures for satisfaction of those Appetites he hath implanted in us towards them? As knowing Spiritual Nature was never designed to satisfy the Body, and that these Creatures were by his Wisdom and Goodness purposely provided to satisfy our bodily Appetites; so that this pompous Rhetorick serves only to Arraign the Providence of God, in making us with Appetites which

not be satisfied without the Creature, and his Wisdom in drawing us to Love and serve him by the promise of these outward Blessings?

Argument 6.

§ 7.
Let. 8. p.
162, 163,
164.

“ Our Conscience doth often upbraid to us
“ the Love of the Creatures, but never, that
“ I know of, doth it reproach us for our in-
“ differency towards them, or prompt us to
“ repent of it. And indeed it would be a
“ strange kind of Repentance, for a Man to
“ fall upon his knees, and confess to God as
“ a Sin, that he had withdrawn all his De-
“ sires from his Creatures, and fixed them up-
“ on Him. I will suppose a Man to place
“ his whole Affection upon God, and so to
“ love him with all his Heart, Soul, Mind,
“ and Strength, as to withdraw his Love
“ from all the Creatures, and not in the least
“ to desire any of them as his Goods.—
“ I farther suppose him to persevere in this
“ disposition of Mind to the very last: And
“ then ask, whether you can think such a
“ Person hath any thing to Answer at the Bar
“ of God’s Justice (upon this account) or
“ whether you think God will Damn, or
“ eternally Separate such a one from his Pre-
“ sence, as defective in his (Duty) meerly
“ for not making the Creature his Good,
“ and the Object of his desire.

Ans.: This *Rhetorical Harangue* is indeed some-
what affecting; but hath nothing of Argu-
ment in it. For when he saith Conscience
doth never reproach us for our indifferency
to the Creature, what thinks he of the *Pro-*
digal

digal who is so indifferent towards it, as that he cares not tho' he spend that in Gaming, or squander it away in Prodigality, which had he been more concerned to keep it, might have preserved himself and his Family from Want and Misery? What thinks he of the Tradesman, who is so indifferent towards the Creature, that he will not give himself the trouble to consider whether he thrives or decays in his Trade or Calling, till at last he breaks, and robs many, who had Dealings with him, of their Right? How easie is it to put twenty Cases of like nature; in some of which an indiscreet Piety and Love to a Parry, joined with this indifference, hath contributed not a little to their Want and Beggary.

And since he will be putting Cases, why stopped he here where he did? *I will suppose*, saith he, *a Man to place his whole Affection upon God, so as to withdraw his Love from all the Creatures; and I suppose him to persevere in this disposition to the last.* And there he stops. I go on therefore to suppose this Man to want Health, Sleep, Clothes, and all things needful to the Body, and to the Preservation of his Wife and Children; and yet so employed in Love to God, that he desires not Rest, Health, nor any thing else needful either for his Body or his Family; and that he perseveres in thus withdrawing his Love from the Creatures to the last; and then ask whether he may not have *something to answer for at the Bar of God's Justice upon that account?* I suppose this Man to be one of the *Alambrados* or a *Quietist*; so intent upon his *Mental Prayer*,

Divine Contemplation, and Union with God, as that he hath withdrawn his Desires wholly from the Concerns of his Estate, his Family, or his own Body. I suppose lastly that this Man withdraws himself thus from the Desire of the Creature, out of a Principle of Religion, either that of the Eucharist, that we are not to labour for the Meat that perisheth, or that of Mr. N. that the Love of God is exclusive of all Love and Desire of the Creature; and that he cannot Love the Creature too little. And then I ask again. Whether this Man may not be defective in his Duty, for not making the Creature the Object of his desire? Whether he may not fall down upon his Knees and say, Lord, I have been so indifferent towards those Creatures which are thy signal Blessings, and thy gracious Gifts, to which all Mankind owe the Preservation of their Souls in Life; that I have not thought them worthy of the least desire, or been concerned to pray to thee for my daily Bread. I have thought it my Duty to love thee so entirely, as to withdraw my Love from my Wife, Children, Relations, Friends and Neighbours, by withdrawing it from those Creatures which could alone enable me to afford them what was needful for the Body; and by so doing I have neglected to provide for those of my own House; and to work with my hands that which is Good, that I might have to give to others, as thou hast commanded me. I have so loved thee with all my Soul, as not to suffer it to desire the Food which was necessary to sustain my Life;

1 Tim. 5. 8.

Eph. 4. 28.

the Love of God.

149

“ Life: And so have *bated that Flesh and Body*, Eph. 5. 29.
 “ I stood bound to nourish and to cherish, and so
 “ as to neglect my natural Rest and Health,
 “ and thereby to contribute to the destruction
 “ of that Life which thou hast given me.
 “ have done all this from such a Principle of
 “ Religion as tends to depreciate thy great
 “ Goodness in affording them, to vilify thy
 “ Blessings, and to make Men slight thy Pro-
 “ mises, as unworthy of the desire of the
 “ Man that truly loves thee; and to lay this
 “ vile Imputation upon thy All-wise Provi-
 “ dence, that it hath planted in us natural
 “ Appetites and Desires, which it would not
 “ have us gratifie.

2dly. To return Question for Question; *Ans^r. 2.*
 When did Conscience upbraid him for pray-
 ing for his daily Bread, or asking with *Agar*,
food convenient for him, or for desiring to pro-
 cure it by honest Industry? I suppose a Man
 to love the temporal Blessings God hath pro-
 mised, and so to make his desire of enjoying
 them one motive to obey and serve him; to
 desire *Life, to love many days, that he may see* Psal. 34. 13.
 Good, and therefore to depart from evil, and *do good*; to desire all things needful for the
 Body which he is to nourish, and for that
 Family he stands bound to provide for. Yea,
 when God hath given him Riches and Wealth,
 to desire to eat thereof, to rejoice in it, and to take Eccles. 2. 14.
 his portion of it, and to make his Soul enjoy Good *ch. 5. 19.*
 in his Labour; I suppose also that he perseveres
 in this disposition of mind to the end, and then
 ask, *Whether you can think such a Person hath*
any thing to Answer for at the Bar of God's
 L 3 Justice

Justice upon that account? Or whether you think God will Damn, or eternally Separate such a one from his Presence as defective in his Love to him, merely for making the Creatures his Good, and the Object of his desire?

Object.

§. 8.

Serm. p. 57,
58, 59.

His last and, in his own Opinion, his strongest Argument for this entire and exclusive Love of God runs thus; "If God be the only true Cause that Acts upon our Spirits, and produces our Pleasure, then he only does us Good; he only perfects our Being, and makes us happy: And if he only does us Good, then he only is our Good, then he only is lovely, then 'tis plain that we ought to love none but him, and him entirely. Or, to Argue backwards, we are to love nothing but what is lovely, *nothing is lovely but what is our Good*; nothing is our Good, but what does us Good; nothing does us Good, but what causeth Pleasure in us; nothing causeth Pleasure in us but God, therefore we are to love nothing but God.

Ans.

In Answering this Objection I shall first shew that it is not agreeable to the Sentiments of Holy Scripture. And,

Act. 9. 36.
2 Cor. 9. 8.
Luke 6. 35.
Gal. 6. 10.

1. Is this Doctrine consistent with all those Exhortations the Scripture every where affords us, to do Good to our needy Brother, and charitably to contribute to the Relief of his Wants, for by abounding in these Alms we are said to *abound in Good Works*; to *Work that which is Good*. By doing these, we are said *αγαθοποιῶν, to do Good*; *αγαθοεργεῖν, to work Good to them*; and by withholding them to

1 Tim. 6. 18.

wish.

151

Tit. 3. 8.

Prov. 8. 21.

Ecclus. i. 17.

Prov. 21.20.

Dan. 10. 3.

Pf. 105. 24

Isa. 32. 18.

Ezek. 16. 12.

Amos 5. 14.
Nab. 2. 2.

Nah. 2. 9.
Lam. 1. 8.

11. 12.

•

L 4

Soul?

Soul? And are not these pleasant things in the Hebrew her *desirable things*, and in the Greek *μιῖρα τὰ ἐμδουμήσια αὐτῆς*? Now is not Wisdom thus recommended to us, that we may be induced to court her for these *desirable things*? These concupiscible Treasures with which she fills the Wise Man's House? And must they not then be lovely, and proper Objects of desire? Do we reap no pleasure from these pleasant Lands, Fields, Vineyards, Houses, Furniture, or this pleasant Bread? Are they not all declared by the Wisdom of God to be *desirable*? And can that be desirable which is in no sense our Good, nor can communicate any Good to us? If so, why may not the Creatures be desirable, though they do us no Good?

- Psal. 19. 1. 3dly, Doth not the Psalmist say, *The Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament sheweth his handy work*? And the Apostle, *That the invisible things, viz. the Godhead and Eternity of him that made them, were seen by the things that were made*; that God had by them clearly made known, τὸ γινώσκον οὐκ οὐκ, that which was known of God: Doth not the Author of the Book *Wisdom* truly say, *That vain were they that could not out of the Good things that were seen, know Him*; that is, neither by considering the works acknowledge the work Master; since by the Beauty and the Greatness of the Creatures proportionably their Maker is seen? Now can it be said of those Creatures which declare to us the Glory of God, and shew us by the Beauty that is in them, the Beauty of their Maker, in whom that which is known of God

God is manifest, being seen in his Works? Can that which thus affords us the knowledge of that God *whom to know is life eternal*, be in no sense our Good, wholly unable to do us any Good? Can they in no measure be the Causes of the Happiness of those *Heathens* to whom they gave the Knowledge of the Nature of God, and a Testimony of his Goodness to them? Can they not give us so much as one grateful Sensation, one little contemptible Pleasure resulting from this Knowledge of God? If, as Solomon says, *Light is sweet, and it is a pleasant thing to behold the Sun*, is it no pleasure thus to view, in his Creatures, the Power, Wisdom, and Goodness of God, and the Beauty, Order, the Benefit which redounds to us from his Creatures. Eccles. 11. 3.

I Answer by way of Concession, That God *Ans. 2.* produceth all our Pleasure, and that he only doth us Good; for so the *Apostle James* ch. 1. 8. assures by saying he is the *Giver of every good and perfect Gift*, he giveth to us *Life and Breath*, Acts 17. 25. and all things, all things are of him, and from him, Rom. 11. 36. saith St. Paul. For all things come of thee, saith 1 Chron. 29. David, and of thine own have we given thee. 14.

Yet if he does us any Good by his Creatures, by the Ministry of *Angels pitching their Tents about us*, may we not love those *Angels* that thus minister to us? May we not desire of God that he would give them charge concerning us? If he does us any Good by the Conversation, Examples, Writings of Good Men, may we not desire them, and their Writings as our Good; i. e. to improve our Knowledge and our Piety? And why then may

A Discourse of

may we not desire any other of God's good Creatures, why not fruitful Seasons, why not Food? If, as St. Paul affirms, God doth *ex-*

Acts 14. 17. demand, do us Good by giving us fruitful Seasons, and by filling our hearts with food and gladness, and doth enable us to do Good to others by them.

Again, Is not God equally the cause of all our pleasing Sensations in us, whether we believe that God himself is the immediate Author of them, or that he hath given us those Faculties which are capable of perceiving a grateful Relish and Sensation in *their regular Application to such Objects as are agreeable to their Nature*, and Divine Bounty hath administered? For instance, let it be indeed the Sun that shines upon us, and that warms us by that Faculty of enlightning and producing heat that God hath given it, seeing it doth this purely by the vertue the Divine Power and Wisdom hath imparted to it, without any Knowledge or Intention of doing us any Good; what portion of our Love can it deserve upon that account, any more than by being the occasion only, or positive condition determining God to produce in us that sweetness which the *Wiseman* saith there is in Light, and that pleasure we find in beholding the Sun, or being heated by his Rays?

Ans. w. 3. 3dly, This seems to me to prove as effectually that we ought to hate nothing but God. For, "If God be the only true Cause that acts upon our Spirits, and produceth all our pain (which Mr. N. doth equally contend for) then he only does us hurt, then he only is our hurt, he only impairs the

“ the Perfection of our Being, and makes us
 “ miserable ; and if he only does us hurt, then
 “ he only is our hurt, and then he only is
 “ hateful, and the proper Object of our ha-
 “ tred ; then 'tis plain we ought to hate none
 “ but him, and him entirely : Or, to Argue
 “ backward, we ought to hate nothing but
 “ what is hateful, nothing is hateful but what
 “ is our hurt, nothing is our hurt but what
 “ does us hurt, nothing doth us hurt but what
 “ causeth pain in us, nothing causeth pain in
 “ us, *saith Mr. N.* but God, therefore we
 “ are to hate nothing but God. The Good
 Lady had urged something of this nature,
 though not with that strength that I have given
 to the Argument ; let us see now what he
 Answers to it.

“ When you speak, *saith he*, of God's be- *Repl. 1.*
 “ ing the cause of pain, either you mean as *Leit. p. 29.*
 “ to this Life, or as to the next ; if as to the
 “ next, that has nothing to do with the Duty
 “ which we owe him here ; if as to this
 “ present Life, the pain that God inflicts up-
 “ on us here is only Medicinal, and in order
 “ to our greater Good, and consequently
 “ from a principle of kindness.

I grant *the Pains of the next World have no-* *Answer.*
thing to do with the Duty we owe to God, any
 otherwise than as they are incentives to it,
 that we may avoid them ; but yet they have
 something to do with his Argument ; for are
 not the Pains and Grievs of the Damned a
modification of the Soul, are not all *modifications*
of the Soul immediately caused by God, and by
 him only ? And must not then the Pains and
 Miseries

Miseries of the Damn'd be, according to this *Philosophy*, immediately caused by God, and by him only? And if these Pains and Miseries be the hurt and evil which the Damn'd suffer, is not that God who doth immediately cause them, the immediate Author of their hurt and evil? And if he only does them hurt, he only by your Argument, is their hurt, and then he only is hateful, and the proper Object of their hatred; then 'tis plain they ought to hate none but him, and him entirely, and then their hatred of him cannot be their Sin. If then it be an absurdity to say the Damned ought to hate God entirely, and him only, his Argument and Hypothesis from which that absurdity so naturally flows, must be absurd. Whereas we who conceive that Mens Damnation is of themselves, that they are their own Tormentors by their reflection on their own Actions, that they have excluded themselves from the Beatifick Vision which would have made them happy, by making themselves incapable of enjoying a God of infinite Purity, that they have rendered themselves unworthy to be snatched out of the Flames of the Earth, when all the things that are in it shall be burned up, and so shall suffer in that Fire which is kept for the Day of Judgment, and of perdition of ungodly Men, whilst the Just shall then be caught up into the Air, and be for ever with the Lord. We, I say, are not at all concerned in this Objection, though Mr. N. imagines that it lies equally against us.

3 Pet. 3. 7.
1 Thes. 4. 17.
Lett. 2. p. 27, 28.

Moreover, is it true that all the Pains which God inflicts upon the Wicked in this Life are Medicinal,

dicinal, and in order to their greater Good? What thinks he of the Despair, Horror, the Agonies both of Soul and Body some desperately wicked Persons lie under at the hour of death? Of the Pains the bloody Hector suffers in a Duel by a mortal Wound? Of the wicked Soldier mortally wounded in the Field? The horrid Criminal presently put upon the Rack and there expiring? The Atheist or Debauched Person taken away by a sudden stroke or by a violent Death? Do they suffer these Pains in order to a greater Good?

“ Though I acknowledge Pain, saith he, to be as truly the effect of God as Pleasure, yet it is not after the same manner the effect of God, as Pleasure is: Pleasure is the natural, genuine and direct effect of God, but Pain comes from him only indirectly and by accident; for first, 'tis of the proper Nature of God to produce Pleasure, as consisting of such essential Excellencies and Perfections as will necessarily beautifie and and make happy those who are, by being in their true rational Order, duly disposed for the Enjoyment of him, but if this same excellent Nature occasion pain to other Spirits, this is only indirectly and by accident, by reason of their moral indisposition for so sovereign a Good. Repl. 2.
Let. 2. p. 17,
18, 19.

“ Again, when God causes Pleasure, 'tis because he wills it for it self, and naturally delights in it, as comporting with his primary design which is the Happiness of his Creatures, but when he causes Pain, 'tis not Answ.

" not that he wills it from within, or for it
 " self, but only from without, and for the
 " sake of something else, as it is necessary to
 " the Order of his Justice; for had there been
 " no Sin, there never would have been such
 " a thing as Pain, which is a plain Argument
 " that God wills our Pleasure as we are Crea-
 " tures, and our Pain only as we are Sin-
 " ners; but now in measuring our Devoirs to
 " God, we are not to consider how he stands
 " affected to us as Sinners, but how he stands
 " affected to us as Creatures.

Answ.

Here it is plain the Good Man shifts the
 Scene, deserts his Subject and his Argument
 at once, that he may seem to avoid the Con-
 sequence which follows from it; for evident it
 is, that in his Sermon he was discoursing of
 those Pleasures and Pains only which by the
 impressions the Creatures made upon us were
 by God produced in us, the Pleasures of the
 Senses, the Eye, the Palate, the Smell, Taste
 and Touch, and the Pains incident to them;
 and from these only is it that he makes his
 Inference, That *Creatures are not to be loved or
 desired at all*, as being not the Causes, but the
 Occasions of these Pleasures, and that God
 only is to be loved, because he only causes
 them. Now is this true of these sensual Plea-
 sures of the Palate, and the Throat, and the
 Belly, of the carnal Pleasures of the Men of
 the World, of the Pleasures of Envy, and the
 Pleasures wicked Men take not only in *doing*
 evil themselves, but in *seeing others* do it; of
 the Pleasure they take in *Rioting in the day time*,
 that

Rom. 1. ult.
 2 Pet. 2. 13.

that 'tis of the proper Nature of God, as consisting of such essential Excellencies and Perfections to produce them, rather than to produce in us that Godly sorrow which works Repentance unto a Cor. 7. 10. Life, the pangs of the New Birth, or those afflicting Pains he lays upon his Children for Heb. 12. 10. their profit, to make them partakers of his Holiness, Ver. 6. and which are the Fruits of that Love which is the chief of his Perfections? When God causeth Pleasure, saith he, he doth it because he wills it for it self, and naturally delights in it as comporting with his primary design, which is the Happiness of his Creatures; does he mean the pleasure of tickling, or of scratching when I have the Itch, or the sensual Pleasures which the Drunkard finds in swallowing down his Liquor, or the Glutton in his delicious Fair, or the Lustful Person in his Unchast Embraces? No, saith he, the Pleasures that beautifie and make us happy in the Enjoyment of God. But what is this to that purpose of his Sermon, or his Argument which only concerns the Pleasures which we find upon occasion of the Creatures making impressions on our Senses? Again, Pain and Pleasure are both truly the effect of God, but not after the same manner, viz. I approach to the fire and it warms me, God is the natural, genuine and direct Cause of this Pleasure: I approach nearer to it, and it burns me, God is the cause of this Pain of burning only indirectly, and by accident, the fire is only the occasion of both; God immediately doth both, his Operation is equally determined to do both by the same occasion; Who then is able to see any reason why

why he should be thought the natural, genuine and direct Cause of the first, and only indirectly and by accident the Cause of the latter?

Again, God, saith he, wills our Pleasures as we are Creatures, and our Pain only as we are Sinners. He would do well to reconcile this with the Sentiments of Mr. Malbranch, That we being Sinners, and by consequence unworthy to be recompens'd by agreeable Sentiments, oblige God, in consequence of his immutable Will to make us feel Pleasure in the time that we offend him: What also doth he think of the Pains of Brut Beasts, which by his Argument must be produced by God only; Doth God produce in them pain only as they are Sinners? What of the pains of the Holy Martyrs flagrant in Flames of Love to God, are they inflicted on them only as they are Sinners? Is it not for the Tryal of their Faith, Patience, Love and Obedience, that the Tryal of their Faith might be found to their Praise, Honour and Glory as the Revelation of the Lord Jesus? What thinks he of the direful Agonies and Sufferings of the Blessed Jesus, was he also a Sinner? Did he not for the Joy that was set before him endure the Cross?

1 Pet. 1. 7.

Hebr. 12. 2.

In finey 'tis certain that the Wicked find the same sentiments of Delight and sensual Pleasures in their sinful, as do the Righteous in their lawful Actions; viz. the lustful Person in his unchast Embraces, as the Good Man in the Marriage Bed. 'Tis certain also that these sensual Delights and Pleasures are very obstructive unto Piety, and great Incentives unto Vice: What hinders the good Seed from bringing

bringing Fruit unto perfection? *ἡδονὰν ἵκναι, the* Luke 8, 14.
 Pleasures of Life, saith Christ. *Ἐνθεν* comes
 wars and fightings among us? *ἐν τῇ ἡδονῇ ὑμῶν, James* 4. 1.
 from your Pleasures, saith St. James. Why do
 you covet, and so zealously affect the World's *Ver. 3.*
 good things? that you may, saith he, spend them,
ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν, in your Pleasures. What
 gave rise to the Corruptions of the Heathen
 World? even this, that they did, *ἑαδόν*
ἐμπόνημας καὶ ἡδονὰς ποιεῖν, serve divers Lusts Tit. 3. 3.
 and Pleasures. Is it not the pleasure we expect
 from the Enjoyment of the Creature, that
 gives the Rise to all that love and that desire
 of the Creature which you so tragically in-
 veigh against? And after all this, will you not
 only determine God's Operation to the production
 of the pleasure of all our sinful Actions, and
 oblige him by an immutable Law to reward our
 Transgressions with Pleasure and Delight,
 and immediately and solely to produce that in
 us which is so obstructive to Piety, so power-
 ful an incentive to that Sin he infinitely hates,
 and is the rise of all that Mischief which flows
 from the Love and Desire of the Creature;
 but also tells us, That God naturally delights in
 them, and wills them for themselves, that they are
 natural, genuine, and direct Effects of God, and
 that 'tis of the proper Nature of God, as consisting
 of such essential Excellencies and Perfections to
 produce them? *Credat Judæus Apella.*

And having thus impartially considered all
 that Mr. N. hath offer'd on this Subject, I
 proceed next to the Discourses of the Good
 Lady on the same Subject; whose Rhetorick is

§. 2.

M

very

very Charming, and her devout Affections highly commendable; but her Arguments seldom reach the point; and when they do, their Strength is not equal to the Beauty of the *Style*.

P. 144, 270.

Grant unto her, that we are not to rest in the Creature as our end; For what we are to love only in due relation to our end, we cannot rest in as our end; That we are not to desire them as our Happiness, or to look upon them

P. 179, 180,

181.

as the completion of our Bliss; because we are to prize God only as the Object of our Bliss and Happiness: That we are not to lay the weight of our Souls upon them; or place our Felicity in them: That we must not cleave to any

P. 143.

Creature, or fix our Hearts upon it; for that is contrary to that superlative Affection to God, which requires us to part with all things, to cleave close unto him. That we must not suf-

Ibid.

fer the Creature to usurp our hearts, or to sit uppermost in our minds; for then we cannot love God above all things. Let her go on with her chaste Rhetorick and Holy Flames, to beat down this inordinate Affection to the Creature; and we will equally admire, and approve her sayings. We accord with her,

P. 133.

That the very best of Creatures are not able to satisfy the Longings, and fill the Capacities of our mind. Whence it will follow, that we must not place our Satisfaction, or the Contentment of our mind in any Creature; which notwithstanding, if the Creature can supply our Wants, and be ordained by the Providence of God to do so, we think it is the proper Object of our desire to have that wans supplied.

supplied. *We ought not to love the World, saith* Letter. 9. p. 185.
he, because of the danger of being conformed to it ;
for nothing is so excellent as imitation as Love, no-
thing does so easily assimilate.

Now doth she here mean the corrupt manners of the World? Her Proposition is invincible; but reaches not the point. If she means the good Things of the World, Food, Drink, Clothes, Houses, Lands, Orchards, Gold or Silver, I hope the danger of assimilation is not here very great. 'Tis granted, That the whole compass of desire must not be carried out after the Creature; for then I could not desire God above all, and before all things. So that my desire of Temporals when lawful, should be comparatively none; and when they hinder my desire of him, should be absolutely none. 'Tis therefore true, That the boundlessness of desire is a plain Indication, that it was never made for the Creature. Only. But will it follow hence, that the Creature was not made for the Satisfaction of our natural Desires, or that our natural Appetites should not move to desire the Enjoyment of them? We grant, That God (virtually) comprehends all possible Good, i. e. that he hath Virtue sufficient to produce it, and that he is the very Fountain and sole Author of it. But will the Love of God assuage her Hunger, quench her Thirst, or cloth her Nakedness? Or is he any other way the satisfier of our Desires of these things, than by affording us those Creatures he made on purpose for those ends? And must not then the hungry Appetite desire these Creatures for its Food, the thirsty for its Drink, &c. But, saith the Good Lady,

Object. *Or* If we allow the Creature to be in any degree our
Let. 5. p. 95. Good, 'tis hard to keep our selves from desiring it;
 and if we permit desire, we can never be secure
 from irregular Love; it being easier not to desire at
 all, then to desire with moderation.

Ans. It is not only hard, but it is sinful to keep
 our selves from desiring the Creature; it be-
 ing to keep our selves from desiring what God
 hath promised, and made the matter of our
 daily Prayer, and to rob our selves of all the
Let. 7. p. Pleasure which ariseth from the Gratification of
150. our natural Appetites or Desires according to, and
 not exceeding the Intention of Nature; and of all
Ibid. p. 149. that grateful Relish or Sensation which every Fa-
 culty enjoys in the regular Application of it self to
 [i. e. in the desire of] such Objects as are
 agreeable to its Nature; that is, of all the in-
 nocent Pleasures of our Lives.

2. Nor is it true, That it is easier not to de-
 sire at all, than to desire with moderation. For
 doubtless, this Excellent Lady desires rest and
 sleep when she doth want them, Food when
 she is hungry, and Drink when she is thirsty,
 and Health when she is sick, and desires all
 these things with moderation; but can she
 with more ease abstain from desiring them at
 all?

3. Though we permit desire; yet if we do
 not permit it to exceed the real Necessities of
 Nature, and the bounds which Scripture hath
 set to it, and having Food and Raiment are there-
 with content: If we pursue the Comforts of this
 present Life, or the Gratifications of our na-
 tural Appetites according to, and so as not to ex-
 ceed the Intention of Nature; if we pursue them
 in relation to, and in due Submission to the
 Will

Will of God; and only by those means; and in those measures he allows of, as Reason and Scripture do require, we cannot be immoderate, and therefore not irregular in the desire of them.

4. Our Hopes, our Fears, our Grief, Delight are subject to the like Irregularities; but must we therefore never permit these Passions to move towards their proper Objects? In fine, love of Benevolence toward our selves, our Friends, Relations, and our Life are too oft excessive, and are indeed the Root of that immoderate desire we have for the Creature; and yet they are commanded. It will not therefore follow, That we may not desire temporal good things at all, because these desires are subject to Irregularity.

If we once permit our Desires to stray after the Object. 2. Creature, we open a Bank to all that Mischief, Malice, and Uncharitableness that is in the World. P. 138.

That is, if I pray; that is, desire of God my daily Bread; if I say to him with *Agar*, *Feed me with Food convenient for me*; if I ask of my Heavenly Father what he knoweth I have need of; if I desire to have what he hath promised, I open a Bank to all that Mischief, Malice and Uncharitableness that is in the World. This is strange Doctrine; yet the *Good Lady* thus attempts to prove it.

Ans.

“ For the Creature being finite and empty *Ibid.*
 “ too, how is it possible, but that a multitude
 “ of Lovers who all desire the same thing,----
 “ should cross each other in these desires and
 “ pursuits, and consequently destroy that
 “ Peace

“ Peace and mutual Benevolence which ought
 “ to be cherished among rational Beings, and
 “ to which the Precepts of the Gospel so
 “ strictly engage us.

Ans. I have already granted that these Creatures are not desired to ~~enrich~~ the Soul, but to supply the Wants of the Body. Now is there any necessity in that fulness which the Earth affords for all, that I should desire what another hath; or that my desire of Meat, Drink and Clothing, which is all that Nature craves, and with which *Christianity* requires me to be content, should move me to cross the natural desires of others to have Meat, Drink and Clothes, when Providence hath made a plentiful provision of these things for us all? A desire thus limited to *contentment with Food and Raiment*, lays a sure Fund for Charity to others, by disposing us to part with what is not thus necessary for our selves, to supply our Brother's Wants; which is all that Charity requires.

Object. 3. “ It is very unreasonable to love the Creature, because it can never answer the end of Love. We desire only in order to Happiness; nothing being desirable any farther, than as it promotes that end: But the Love of the Creature is more apt to hinder, than advance our Happiness; and therefore in all Reason, Creatures are not to be thought desirable.

Ans. I Answer, That we desire not only in order to our final Happiness, but also in order to the Gratification and Satisfaction of our Bodily

dily Wants. For what we so far need, as that we are not able to live without it, we must desire, as much as we desire to subsist; tho' the desire of Life in itself should be in order to God's Glory, and the Welfare of our Souls. And therefore in that sense even the desire of that Food by which we do sustain that Life, is a desire of it in order to our Happiness.

2. To say this Generally, and without all Restriction, that the Love, that is, as she herself Interprets it, the desire of the Creature is more apt to binder than advance our Happiness, is in effect to say that God himself doth move us to love and to obey him by the promise of things more apt to binder than advance our Happiness; and that he hath Imprinted in us natural Desires of such things; and that our Lord commands us daily to desire and pray for what rather tends to binder than advance our Happiness.

3. In fine, When the Lady saith, This is most certain, that what we love will be uppermost in our minds; I desire her to consider, that 'tis a contradiction to say, That what I love only in relation, and in Subordination to another, whom I do value above all things, should be uppermost in my Mind; that is, preferred in my Mind before that very Being my Mind doth value much above it.

Books lately Printed for A. and J. Churchill.

Prince Arthur. An Heroick Poem. In 10 Books. Fol.
 King Arthur. An Heroick Poem. In 12 Books. Fol.
 Both by Sir Rich. Blackmore, Kt. Physician to His Majesty.

Tractatus de Visitatione Infermorum, Seu de eis Parochorum Officiis. Quae Infirmos, & Moribundos respiciunt. In Gratiarum Juniorum, & in Visitandis Infirmis novus Exercitationum Editus. Autore Johanne Sterne, S. T. D. & Vicario de Trimm, in Diocesi Midenfi.

A Common-Place Book to the Holy Bible: Or, the Scriptures Sufficiency Practically Demonstrated. Wherein whatsoever is contain'd in Scripture, respecting Doctrine, Worship, or Manners, is reduced to its Proper Head: Weighty Cases Resolv'd, Truths Confirm'd, difficult Texts Illustrated, and Explain'd by others more plain. 4°

Mr. Locke's Letter to the Bishop of Worcester. 8°

Mr. Kettlewell's Office for Prisoners for Crimes, and for Prisoners for Debts. 12°

A Second Vindication of the Reasonableness of Christianity. By the Author of the Reasonableness of Christianity.

Mr. Robert Peirce's Bath Memoirs: Or, Observations in Three and Forty Years Practice at the Bath, &c. 8°

Mr. Bold's Discourse of the Knowledge of Christ Jesus. To which are added some Passages in the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. With some Animadversions on Mr. Edward's Reflections on the same. 8°

Mr. Bold's Reply to Mr. Edward's Reflection on the same. 8°

There is now Printing a New Edition of the large Cambridge Concordance, in Folio, with great Improvements; To which Edition is added, The Concordance to the Apocrypha, never before Published. To be sold by A. and J. Churchill.

The first of these is the fact that the
 Government has been unable to secure
 the necessary funds to carry out its
 policy of non-interference. This is
 due to the fact that the Government
 has been unable to secure the necessary
 funds to carry out its policy of non-
 interference. This is due to the fact
 that the Government has been unable
 to secure the necessary funds to carry
 out its policy of non-interference.